The Journal of Historical Review

THIS ISSUE

Papers Presented at the
1980 Revisionist Convention
at Pomona College
Claremont, California

SS Confessions about Auschwitz

Civil War Concentration Camps

The Malmédy Massacre

also

Allied War Crimes Trials

The Reichstag Fire

Zionism & U.S. Jews

ALSO

Letters to the Editor

Revisionist Announcements

Volume Two, Number Two Summer 1981

The Journal of Historical Review

Volume Two, Number Two **Summer 1981**

EDITOR
LEWIS BRANDON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
THOMAS J. MARCELLUS

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

DR. WALTER BEVERAGGI ALLENDE
UNIVERSITY OF BUENOS AIRES, Buenos Aires

DR. AUSTIN J. APP
LA SALLE COLLEGE, Philadelphia (Ret.)

JOHN BENNETT
VICTORIAN COUNCIL FOR CIVIL LIBERTIES
Melbourne, Australia

DR. REINHARD K. BUCHNER
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, Long Beach

DR. ARTHUR R. BUTZ
NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY, Evanston

DR. ROBERT FAURISSON
UNIVERSITY OF LYON-2, Lyon, France

DITLIEB FELDERER
Revisionist History Magazine, Täby Sweden

PERCY L. GREAVES JR.
Libertarian Economist

THOMAS HENRY IRWIN
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

SAMUEL EDWARD KONKIN III
The New Libertarian, Long Beach

DR. MARTIN A. LARSON
The Spotlight, Washington D.C.

DR. JAMES J. MARTIN
INSTITUTE FOR HISTORICAL REVIEW

DR. REVILO P. OLIVER
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, Urbana

DR. WILHELM STÄGLICH
Retired Judge, West Germany

RICHARD VERRALL
New Nation, London

UDO WALENDY
VERLAG FÜR VOLKSTUM & ZEITGESCHICHTSFORSCHUNG
Vlotho/Weser, West Germany

DR. CHARLES E. WEBER
UNIVERSITY OF TULSA, Oklahoma

DR. ANDREAS R. WESSERLE
MARQUETTE UNIVERSITY, Milwaukee (Ret.)

The Journal of Historical Review (ISSN: 0195-6752) is published quarterly by the Legion for the Survival of Freedom, P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505, United States of America. Subscriptions cost U.S. $20.00 per year, or the equivalent in foreign currency. Foreign subscribers should add $5 if paying with a remittance drawn on a foreign bank. For air-mail delivery overseas, please also add $5. Bulk subscription rates are available on request. Manuscripts are welcomed by the Editor, but must be accompanied by return postage.

Listed:

Library of Congress
British Library
Encyclopedia of Associations
Writers Market 1981
PTLA Catalog

ISSN: 0195-6752

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, Ca. 90505, U.S.A.

Permission is hereby granted for reprints of any article contained herein, providing that no changes or alterations are made before off-printing, and also providing that the following attribution is included:

"Reprinted by permission of THE JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL REVIEW, P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505, United States of America. Subscription rate: $20.00 per year."

Two copies of each offprint should be submitted to the Editor.

CONTENTS

Letters to the Editor.....100

Confessions of SS Men who were at Auschwitz.....103
Robert Faurisson

The Civil War Concentration Camps.....137
Mark Weber

Allied War Crimes Trials.....155
Andreas R. Wesserle

The Malmédy Massacre and Trial.....165
Ray Merriam

Fire in the Reichstag.....177
Peter Wainwright

Zionism & American Jews.....181
Alfred M. Lilienthal

About the Contributors.....192

Letters to the Editor

20 January 1981

Dear Lewis:

I was quite fascinated by Dr. Howard Stein's article on Psychohistory in your Winter 1980 issue. There are two extremely valuable books devoted to this subject: *A Psychohistory of Zionism* by Jay Gonen (which Stein refers to) and *The Israeli Women* by Lesley Hazleton. Both books are reviewed in the excellent "Zionism is not Judaism" issue (December 1978) of *The Campaigner* (304 West 58th Street, New York, NY 10019; $2). (This issue is also significant in that the Editorial of this issue says that the "Six Million" is a lie; page 2).

Hazleton points out that the Hebrew language is brim full of sexual-political fantasies. *Gever*, the Hebrew word for "man" also means rooster or cock. The word for "weapon" is *zayin*, which also means penis. The phrase for Israel's armed forces can therefore be translated as "roosters equipped with penises." The Hebrew verb "to take up arms" also means "to have sexual intercourse."

The Israeli intelligence service, the Mossad, and the Israeli military use as their code-instructions certain phrases from the Kabbala, the 15th/16th Century book of Jewish Magick. Soldiers are mobilized for war exercises with such phrases as "The Elders' Council," "Study of the Torah" and "Product of the Soil." Ashkenazim (Khazar) Jews from Eastern Europe take up adopted Hebrew names in Israel, but almost always using words with virility connotations, such as "antagonist," "strength," "towering," "lightning," "bear" and "lion."

Hazleton notes an incestuous overtone in Zionist philosophizing. She quotes a *kibbutz* leader Meir Yaari, who openly referred to the sexual nature of the *kibbutzniks*' zeal. The land they tilled, he said, was their bride, and they themselves "the bridegroom who abandons himself in his bride's bosom. . .thus we abandon ourselves to the motherly womb of the sanctifying earth."

Hazelton also refers to the Old Testament writings of Isaiah and Ezekiel. "As a mystical idea, the return to Zion afforded the bond of a future but never-to-be-achieved-in-our-lifetime Redemption. It was imagined, as Isaiah indicates, in terms of the return of son to mother in sexual union."

Then, citing the prophet Ezekiel's characterization of "non-Jewish" sovereignty over Jerusalem as tantamount to acts of

"multiple harlotry" Hazelton writes:

> The sons were to mount Zion in the role of rescuer and sexual claimant, the young groom returning to claim his bride; the son his mother. The result of the intercourse between son and mother would be the rebirth of the son himself, who would give new life to his mother by saving her from the iniquities of suffering under foreign rule, and restore her innocence and light as mother and life-giver.

It would indeed be interesting to gather evidence of a possible relationship between and among the following attitudes among Jews:

SEXUAL-PSYCHOLOGICAL	POLITICAL-HISTORICAL
Oedipus Complex	Zealous Zionism
Incest	"Aliya" ("Return to Zion")
Sado-Masochism	"Holocaust" atrocities; sex-shop Nazism
Anal Complex	Scatalogical references throughout "Holocaust" memoirs
Homosexuality	Ritual circumcision (hatred of an inadequate penis); Israeli suppression of women's rights; rejection of menstruating wife; not counting woman's evidence in court or presence in synagogue quorum
Paranoia	Imagined "anti-Semitism"; wanting to be "Holocausted"
Megalomania	War Zionism; Zionist suppression of Free Speech on the "Holocaust"; Zionist manipulation of U.S. politicians and media

Without a doubt there is a rich seam of psychohistorical ore to be mined in this area. Dr. Stein has dug up a fine nugget. Who will have the courage to start strip-mining?

Revisionistically

Sandra Ross
London, England

Sir:

The central point of Dr. Howard F. Stein's article, "The Holocaust and the Myth of the Past as History," is, I believe, wholly valid. World Jewry does indeed have a psychic need to believe in the "holocaust" and for that reason, no amount of published empirical research or logical argument will ever shake that belief among the commonality of Jews although some sophisticated Jewish academics and intellectuals (Dr. Stein himself, for example) are at least uneasy with it. It is very similar to the desperate emotional and psychological need of Blacks not to deal with the theories of Jensen, Shockley, Shuey, *et al*, in a rational or objective way.

But we should not overlook the added element in the perpetuation of the holocaust myth which is stressed by Richard Harwood among others. There is a tremendous enhancement of political power for Jewry in the United States and Western Europe and of virtually unlimited financial gain for Israel in the myth. This factor operates both on the conscious and the unconscious level.

Beyond this, Dr. Stein's enthusiasm for psycho-history needs to be looked at with some degree of cool objectivity and scepticism. Good historians have always been aware of the psychological—often Freudian—determinants in history. Alexander the Great is only one of the most obvious examples of this: there is, and can be, almost no dispute about the oedipal factors there. But there is some danger of psycho-history degenerating into a mere fad—or at best a kind of monolithic theory of history which explains all the past. Oddly enough, that particular way of thinking has long seemed to me very characteristic of the intellectual Jew: Marx's economic determinism, Freud's libido, Einstein's Unified Field theory—even Judaic monotheism. Psycho-history has only recently been given a name and it is the latest arrival in the field. Jews might respond by arguing that racialists fall into the same trap and sometimes there is truth in such allegations. Personally, I believe that race is probably the most important single factor in history and I rejoice in the new insights of Sociobiology but, since racial instincts can be perverted and corrupted and become a source of guilt and impotence, it is clear that other factors also play a part.

Sincerely yours,

29 December 1980

Wayland D. Smith, Ph.D
Los Angeles, California

Confessions of SS Men who were at Auschwitz

ROBERT FAURISSON

Some SS men have confessed that there were some "gas chambers" at Auschwitz or at Auschwitz-Birkenau. The three most important confessions are those of Rudolf Höss, of Pery Broad and, finally, of Professor Doctor Johann Paul Kremer. For a long time the Exterminationists have especially counted on the first of these confessions: that of Rudolf Höss, which appeared under the title *Commandant of Auschwitz*. I think that I noticed, on the occasion of a recent historical debate in France, that the Exterminationists seem less sure of the value of this strange testimony. On the other hand, the testimony of Johann Paul Kremer has been very useful to them. Personally, I think that the argument furnished by Kremer is in fact, from their point of view, a more valuable weapon than the absurd confession of Rudolf Höss. I must say that first the British and then the Poles made Höss speak in such a way that it is easy to destroy his testimony by simply comparing *Commandant of Auschwitz* with his numerous previous statements, among which I particularly recommend that of 14 March 1946 (Documents NO-1210 and D-749).

I will limit myself therefore to studying what the Exterminationists themselves today seem to consider as the best of their weapons in respect to the existence and the use at Auschwitz of homicidal "gas chambers." If I add this adjective "homicidal," it is because there are, as you know, non-homicidal gas chambers which it is impossible to use to kill men as it is said that the Germans did. All of the armies of the world have some buildings, hastily equipped, for training their recruits in the wearing of gas masks. In France, these buildings bear the name "*chambre à gaz*" ("gas chamber"); in Germany, they are called "*Gaskammer*" or

"*Gasraum*" ("Gas Chamber" or "gas room"). There are also gas chambers for the disinfecting of clothes, for treating fruit, and the like.

I will therefore speak to you at some length of the testimony of Johann Paul Kremer. You will see how, at first sight, it is troubling, and then how, if you analyze it with a little care, it constitutes a terrible fiasco for the Exterminationists. I prize the Kremer case very much. It shows how fragile are the proofs that people offer to us, to what extent they allow themselves to be easily deceived by appearances, how much the official historians have misused the texts and how it is necessary to work if you wish, in the study of texts, to distinguish between the true and the false, between the real meaning and the misinterpretation. This is what is called text and document criticism. It happens that it is my professional specialty. I am therefore going to inflict upon you, to my great regret, a course in "text and document criticism." I ask you to pardon me for the strictness of the demonstration that I am going to try to carry out in front of you.

Before entering into the heart of the subject, I would like to share with you two remarks. The first comes to us from Dr. Butz. I remember that, in a letter of 18 November 1979 addressed to a British weekly (*New Statesman*) about a long article by Gitta Sereny (2 November 1979) he made the observation that it is quite strange to claim to base a historical thesis like that of the formidable massacres of millions of human beings on. . .*confessions*. That claim is still harder to defend when you know that those confessions came from persons who had been conquered and that the ones who obtained those confessions were the conquerors.

My second remark is to recall that, in the cases from Ravensbrück where people now know that there never was any "gassing," the British and French courts obtained confessions which were particularly detailed on the alleged "gassings." People speak to us about the three principal confessions of Auschwitz, but they no longer speak to us at all about the three principal confessions of Ravensbrück: that of the camp commandant, Suhren, that of his adjutant Schwarzhuber and that of the camp physician, Dr. Treite. Do you know what was the size of that "gas chamber" that never existed? Answer: nine meters by four and one half

tin Grays and the Filip Müllers still have a good future before them. Two of the three persons who confessed at Ravensbrück were hanged, and Dr. Treite committed suicide. What is horrible is that without this lie about the "gas chambers" they would perhaps have saved their lives. In regard to Suhren, Germaine Tillion wrote, on page 16, that he began by displaying a "stubborn bad faith" in the course of his two trials (one at Hamburg, by the British and one at Rastatt, by the French); she adds this terrible sentence: "But, without that gas chamber created by him, on his own initiative, two months before the collapse, he could perhaps have saved his life." In note 2 on page 17, she wrote in regard to Schwarhuber, who confessed immediately, these still more terrible lines, each word of which I ask you to ponder:

> According to the English investigators, from the first moment he had coolly faced his position, he judged himself lost and either to have peace (and the small privileges to which the prisoners who do not deceive the examing magistrates have a right, or else due to lassitude, indifference or to quite another reason) he took his course and held to it, without regard for himself or for his accomplices. He was not a brute (like Binder or Pflaum); he had an intelligent expression, the appearance and behavior of a psychologically normal man.

Let us leave Ravensbrück and the confession of Schwarzhuber for Auschwitz and the confession of Kremer, the other SS man who had "an intelligent expression" as well as "the appearance and the behavior of a psychologically normal man." To begin with, let us look at some extracts from his private diary written during his short stay at Auschwitz, and then at the explanations that he gave to those extracts, after the war, to his Polish jailers, explanations that he held to later on in 1960 at his trial which took place at Münster (Westphalia) and at the trial of the Auschwitz guards, in 1964, at Frankfurt-on-Main. The name of Professor Doctor Kremer should not be confused with that of Josef Kramer. The latter had high positions successively at the camp of Struthof-Natzweiler (Alsace), then at Auschwitz-Birkenau, and finally at Bergen-Belsen. In his case also there were various confessions. All are interesting to

study. On the alleged homicidal "gas chamber" at Struthof, I would like to point out that the French did not wring out of him, as I until recently still believed, only a single confession but, as I have recently discovered, two totally absurd and wonderfully contradictory confessions. Of the one people sometimes speak, while the other was carefully kept hidden. I will some day speak about it, as well as about the two reports of the French Military Courts on that "gas chamber" at Struthof: the one, really childish, which concludes on the existence of "gassings"; and another one, which has disappeared from the archives of the military courts, which reaches the opposite conclusion: this report, dated 1 December 1945, was done by the eminent toxicologist, Professor Rene Fabre.

1. EXTRACTS FROM THE DIARY OF DR. JOHANN PAUL KREMER (DOCTOR AT AUSCHWITZ DURING THE SUMMER OF 1942), SELECTED AND PRESENTED BY THE OFFICIAL HISTORIANS (LEON POLIAKOV, GEORGES WELLERS, SERGE KLARSFELD,. . .)

2 September 1942: This morning, at three o'clock, I was present for the first time at a *Sonderaktion*. Compared to that, Dante's Inferno appears to be a comedy. It is not without reason that Auschwitz is called extermination camp. (the version of Georges Wellers, in *Le Monde*, 29 December 1978, p8; the author explains beforehand that a *Sonderaktion* is a "selection for the gas chambers.")

At three o'clock in the morning, I was present for the first time at a "special action" (thus did they refer to the selection and murder in the gas chambers). In comparison with the Inferno of Dante that seemed to me almost a comedy. It is not without reason that they call Auschwitz an extermination camp.
(the version of Serge Klarsfeld, in *Le Mémorial de la Déportation des Juifs de France* [*Memorial to the Deportation of the Jews from France,*] 1978, p245; the author has obviously reproduced page 48 of a book (not dated) published in Poland by the International Auschwitz Committee under the title *KL Auschwitz; Arbeit Macht Frei* (*Concentration Camp Auschwitz/Work Makes You Free*), 96 pages.)

> This morning at three o'clock, I was present for the first time at a "special action." In comparison, Dante's Inferno appeared to me a comedy. It is not for nothing that Auschwitz is called an extermination camp.
> (Léon Poliakov's version, in *Auschwitz*, Collection Archives Gallimard/Julliard, 1973, p40).

For this first date of 2 September, I have cited three versions. For the following dates, I will content myself with citing a single version: the official version of the State Museum of Oświęcim (Auschwitz), such as it appeared in *Auschwitz vu par les SS* (*Auschwitz Seen by the SS*), French translation, 1974. I will confine myself intentionally only to what the official historians have the habit of citing in their works and only to what, in the eyes of the authorities of the State Museum of Auschwitz, would tend to prove that Dr. Kremer had participated in the "gassings" of human beings.

> 5 September 1942: This noon was present at a special action in the women's camp ("Moslems")—the most horrible of all horrors. *Hscf.* Thilo, military surgeon, is right when he said today to me we were located here in "*anus mundi*" [*anus of the world*]. In the evening at about 8p.m. another special action with a draft from Holland. Men compete to take part in such actions as they get additional rations then—1/5 litre vodka, 5 cigarettes, 100 grammes of sausage and bread. Today and tomorrow (Sunday) on duty.

On the next day, Dr. Kremer said that he had had an excellent lunch. On numerous occasions, his diary contains in that way some remarks about food. Historians often cite these remarks to show the cynicism of the doctor; they say that the atrocities of the "gas chambers" do not hurt his appetite. Dr. Kremer mentions a special action of Sunday, 6 September at 8 o'clock in the evening, then on the evening of 9 September, then on the morning of 10 September, then in the night of the 23rd and on that of the 30th. He writes then:

> 7 October 1942: Present at the 9th special action (new arrivals and women "Moslems") [. . .]

> 12 October 1942: [. . .] was present at night at another special action with a draft from Holland (1600 persons).

Horrible scene in front of the last bunker! This was the 10th special action.

18 October 1942: In wet and cold weather was on this Sunday morning present at the 11th special action (from Holland). Terrible scenes when 3 women begged to have their bare lives spared.

8 November 1942: This night took part in 2 special actions in rainy and murky weather (12th and 13th) [. . .] Another special action in the afternoon, the 14th so far, in which I had participated [. . .]

Dr. Kremer is wrong in his counting. He has forgotten that on 5 September there had been not one but two special actions, which made a total of 15 special actions for his stay at Auschwitz. This stay listed for 81 days, of which only 76 were on duty (because of a five day leave).

The notes in the Polish edition say that the dates of these special actions coincide with the dates of the arrival of the convoys of deportees.

2. EXTRACTS FROM THE SPONTANEOUS CONFESSIONS OF JOHANN PAUL KREMER IN THE POLISH COURT, IN 1947, SELECTED AND PRESENTED BY THE POLISH COURT

Here is what one can read in *KL Auschwitz seen by the SS*, p214, note 50:

In the official record of the interrogatory of 18 August 1947, Cracow, Kremer stated as follows: "On 2 September 1942, at 3 a.m. I was already assigned to take part in the action of gassing people. These mass murders took place in small cottages situated outside the Birkenau camp in a wood. These cottages were called 'bunkers' (*Bunker*) in the *SS* men's slang. All *SS* surgeons, on duty in the camp, took turns to participate in the gassings, which were called '*Sonderaktion*' (special action—Editor's note). My part as surgeon at the gassing consisted in remaining in readiness near the bunker. I was brought there in a car. I sat in front with the driver and an *SS* hospital orderly (*SDG*) sat in the back of the car with an oxygen apparatus to revive *SS* men, employed in

> the gassing, in case any of them should succumb to the poisonous fumes. When the transport with people, who were destined for gassing, arrived at the railway ramp the SS officers selected from among the arrivals persons fit to work and the rest—old people, all children, women with children in arms and other persons not deemed fit to work—were loaded upon lorries and driven to the gas-chambers. I used to follow behind the transport till we reached the bunker [Faurisson note: the word is in the singular]. Here people were first driven to barracks where the victims undressed and then went naked to the gas-chambers. Very often no incidents occurred, as the SS men kept people quiet, maintaining that they were to bathe and be deloused. After driving all of them into the gas-chamber the door was closed and an SS man in a gasmask threw the contents of a *Cyklon* tin through an opening in the side wall. Shouting and screaming of the victims could be heard through that opening and it was clear that they fought for their lives [*Lebenskampf*]. These shouts were heard for a very short time. I should say for some minutes but I am unable to give the exact span of time."

On page 215 of *KL Auschwitz seen by the SS*, note 51 gives another extract from the same interrogation transcript. Here is how Dr. Kremer is supposed to have explained his entry on 5 September 1942 about the "Moslem" women and the *anus mundi*:

> Particularly unpleasant had been the action of gassing emaciated women from the women's camp. Such individuals were generally called "*Muselmänner*" ("Moslems"). I remember taking part in the gassing of such women in daylight. I am unable to state how numerous that group had been. When I came to the bunker [Faurisson note: "bunker" is in the singular] they sat clothed on the ground. As the clothes were in fact worn out camp clothes they were not let into the barracks but undressed in the open. I could deduce from the behavior of these women that they realized what was awaiting them. They begged the SS men to be allowed to live, they wept, but all of them were driven to the gas chamber and gassed. Being an anatomist I had seen many horrors, had to do with corpses, but what I then saw was not to be compared with anything seen ever before. It was under the influence of these impressions that I had noted in my diary, under the

date of 5 September 1942: "The most horrible of all horrors. *Hauptsturmführer* Thilo—was right saying today to me that we were located here in '*anus mundi*'. I had used this expression because I could not imagine anything more sickening and more horrible."

On the date of 12 October 1942, Dr. Kremer had mentioned a special action concerning 1600 persons who had come from the Netherlands: in the margin next to that mention he had written the name of Hössler, who at that time was one of the SS men responsible for the camp at Birkenau. Here is how Dr. Kremer is supposed to have explained that entry of 12 October (see page 224, note 77):

In connection with the gassing action, described by me in my diary under the date 12 October 1942. I have to explain that circa 1600 Dutchmen were then gassed. This is an approximate number which I had put down after hearing it mentioned by others. This action was conducted by SS officer Hössler. I remember how he had tried to drive the whole group into one bunker. He was successful except for one man whom it was not by any means possible to squeeze inside the bunker. This man was killed by Hössler with a pistol shot. I therefore wrote in my diary about horrible scenes in front of the last bunker and I mentioned Hössler's name in connection with this incident.

For his entry of 18 October 1942, Dr. Kremer is supposed to have furnished the following explanation (see 226, note 83):

During the special action, described by me in my diary under the date of 18 October 1942, three women from Holland refused to enter the gas-chamber and begged for their lives. They were young and healthy women, but their begging was of no avail. The SS men, taking part in the action, shot them on the spot.

3. IN 1960, AT HIS TRIAL IN MUNSTER, DR. KREMER PERSISTED IN THESE CLAIMS

The University of Amsterdam in 1977 published its 17th volume of *Justiz und NS-Verbrechen* (*Justice and the Nazi Crimes*). There we find the text of the decision rendered

against Dr. Kremer on 29 November 1960. On pages 19 and 20, the court sought to describe the operation of "gassing" as well as the part that the accused was supposed to have taken personally in that operation. The court speaks of a single "gas chamber." It is a question of a farm near the Birkenau camp made up of several separate parts. An SS medical orderly went up on the roof and dumped some *Zyklon* through some specially fitted shafts ("*durch Einwurfschächte*"). He wore a gas mask. The doors of the "gas chamber" were all air tight. From outside they heard the victims cry out. And the court continued:

> When no more sign of life was shown, the defendant was taken back to his lodging by the Health Service car. The gas chambers were opened a short moment afterwards. (Faurisson note: I ask that you note well that the opening was made A SHORT MOMENT AFTER the death of the victims). The bodies were removed by some prisoners and were destroyed by cremation. During the events described above (Faurisson note: The court here alludes to his description of the arrival of the victims, their disrobing, etc.) the accused was seated in the Health Service car, which was stopped in the immediate vicinity of the gas chambers. Whether he had left his car and whether he had taken an active part in the murderous action could not be proved. The accused kept himself however in the car, in accordance with the mission that had been given to him, prepared for a case where something would happen to the SS man certified by the Health Service who was handling the *Zyklon B* poison; he would bring him immediate help with the oxygen inhalator. He [the accused] had himself admitted that in all good faith. But that accident in reality never happened.

4. IN 1964, AT THE FRANKFURT TRIAL, DR. KREMER PERSISTS STILL IN HIS CLAIMS

On June 1964, Dr. Kremer, then 80 years old, appeared at the bar of the court in Frankfurt as a witness for the prosecution against the former Auschwitz guards. In order to know exactly what he said on that day, we are reduced to pages 72-73 of Hermann Langbein's book *Der Auschwitz-Prozess/ Eine Dokumentation* (*The Auschwitz Trial/ A Documentation*), Vienna, Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1965,

1027 pages). What is unfortunate is that Hermann Langbein is the Secretary of the International Concentration Camp Committee and that his works all show a biased and partisan spirit. The book by Bernd Naumann says almost nothing on the deposition of Dr. Kremer (*Auschwitz*, Frankfurt, Athenaum Verlag, 1965, 552 pages). Therefore, here is how, according to Hermann Langbein, the deposition of Dr. Kremer went on the question of the "gas chambers"; I am reproducing the text in its entirety:

Judge: Where did the gassings take place?

Kremer: Some old farms had been transformed into a bunker (Faurisson note: the German text indeed gives the singular: *Alte Bauernhäuser waren als Bunker ausgebaut*) and provided with a sliding door for secure closing. Upstairs was located a dormer window. The people were brought in undressed. They entered quietly; only some of them balked; they were taken aside and shot. The gas was released by an SS soldier. For that he went up on a ladder.

Judge: And there were some special rewards for those who participated in such an action?

Kremer: Yes, that was the custom; a little schnaps and some cigarettes. They all wanted them. They allotted the goods. I myself also received such goods—this was quite automatic.

Representative of Co-Plaintiff Ormond: You wrote in your diary that the SS soldiers strove with each other for service on the ramp [for the arrival of the convoys].

Kremer: That is humanly quite understandable. This was war was it not, and the cigarettes and schnaps were rare. When someone was eager for cigarettes. . .They collected the goods and then they took themselves to the canteen with their bottles.

The testimony of Dr. Kremer on the "gassings" at Auswitz is limited to these few questions and answers. Here, in conclusion, is the commentary of Langbein:

The man who described the process of gassing with these

bland and indifferent words is the former university professor Dr. Johann Paul Kremer of Münster. He had already been condemned in Poland and in Germany for his participation in mass murders. At Frankfurt he left the witness stand smiling softly.

5. EXTRACTS FROM THE DIARY: MY EXPLANATIONS AND MY COMMENTARIES

I note first that these extracts contain neither the word "gassing" nor the expression "gas chamber."

The diary of Dr. Kremer was a private diary. The doctor expressed himself freely there. He frankly expressed his horror of the camp. He does not mince words. He compares what he sees to a vision from Dante. One can therefore think that, if he had seen those virtual human slaughterhouses which the "gas chambers" would have been, he would have mentioned that absolute horror. Wouldn't Dr. Kremer, as a scientist, at least have noted some precise physical details about these slaughterhouses which, in the history of science, would have been an amazing invention?

But let us begin at the beginning. Did Dr. Kremer in fact write what they say that he wrote? The answer to that question is *no, absolutely not.* His text has been gravely distorted. This is even the work of a forger. As an example I am going to reproduce the text in the version given by Georges Wellers but I am going to insert in it, in capital letters in *italic*, what he has omitted and I am going to insert in place of *Sonderaktion* and of *extermination*, which are misinterpretations, the two words which fit; I will also put them in capital letters. Therefore, here is the text translated from the original German (see document NO-3408 in the National Archives):

> 2 September 1942: This morning, at 3 o'clock, I was present *OUTSIDE* for the first time at a *SPECIAL ACTION*. Compared to that, Dante's Inferno appears *TO ME ALMOST LIKE* a comedy. It is not without reason that Auschwitz is called *THE* camp of *THE ANNIHILATION*!

Every text must be scrupulously respected, especially when the text is supposed to serve as the basis for a shock-

ing demonstration and for a terrible accusation. The concealing of the word OUTSIDE is very serious. Why, after having given us the indication of the time, has the indication of the place been concealed? The German text says: *DRAUSSEN*. Dr. Kremer was not in a closed place as a gas chamber would have been. He was "outside," "on the outside." Without doubt that detail is not very clear, and perhaps it meant "out of the camp itself," but one must not conceal that possibility.

For *Sonderaktion*, Wellers has kept the German word; in appearance, this is evidence of scrupulousness and care; in reality, it is a clever trick. As a matter of fact, this word, at least for a French reader, has a sound that is disturbing, Germanic, barbaric, and can only conceal horrible things. But there is even more: just before citing that entry by Dr. Kremer, Wellers, in his article in *Le Monde*, wrote: "[Kremer] had participated in the selection for the gas chambers (*Sonderaktion*)." In other words, Wellers imposes on his reader the following lie: in his diary, Dr. Kremer said in so many words: "this morning at 3 o' clock I was present at a selection for the gas chambers."

We see very well now that it was nothing of the kind. Dr. Kremer was contented to speak of a "special action." What is one to understand by that expression? To some people who, like me, doubt the existence of the homicidal "gas chambers" it is absurd to answer, as does Wellers, by positing their existence at once as an accepted fact. Suppose that someone does not believe in the existence of flying saucers. To such a person one could not retort that those saucers exist since, in such and such a report by the police, it is written: "A witness declares that he saw something *special* in the sky"—"Some witnesses noted in the sky some *unusual* phenomena." Therefore, for the time being, the only honest—if not very clear—translation of *Sonderaktion* could only be "special action." I will later come back to the probable meaning of this word about which, for the moment, we have no right to speculate.

Dr. Kremer did not write next: "Compared to that, Dante's Inferno seemed to be a comedy" but: "Compared to that, Dante's Inferno seemed TO ME ALMOST LIKE a comedy." Here, the concealing of three words by Wellers is perhaps not very important, but it contributes in its modest

way to doing violence to the meaning of the text, always with a view to producing the same effect. There is a shade of difference between "seemed like," in which one senses a softening, and "seemed to be," which is more affirmative. Dr. Kremer has not transformed an impression which was personal to him into an impression common to a whole human group. In some sense, he did not state: "Dante's Inferno appeared here to everyone around me like a comedy"; if he had stated that, one could suppose that he was present at an unquestionably Dantesque scene. In reality, he contented himself with a confidence of a personal kind and in effect he wrote: "Dante's Inferno here appeared TO ME, who had just arrived (that impression is personal to me, yet others can perhaps share it) ALMOST LIKE a comedy." In other words, the scene is certainly horrible for this doctor who has just arrived for the first time in his life in a concentration camp, but all the same not to the point of decreeing that Dante's Inferno is obviously a comedy to everybody in comparison with this scene.

But there is something very much more serious that Georges Wellers has made the Kremer text undergo. Kremer did not say that Auschwitz was "called an extermination camp," which, in the original German, would have been: "*genannt Vernichtungslager.*"

In reality, we read in the original German:

> "*genannt DAS Lager DER Vernichtung*" ("called THE camp of THE annihilation").

If Wellers had respected the presence of the two articles and if he had given to "*Vernichtung*" the meaning of "extermination" which is indispensible to his exterminationist thesis, he would have gotten the following phrase: "It is not without reason that Auschwitz is called the camp of the extermination." Thus constructed, the phrase sounds bizarre both in German and in French. That has to be for us the sign that a word of the text undoubtedly has been badly translated. That word, as will be seen later on, is "*Vernichtung.*" The context will reveal to us that that word is not to be translated as "extermination" (a meaning that it can very well have in other contexts) but by "annihilation."

There is here no extermination, murder, assassination, killing, nor massacre; there are not the results of an act, an action, or a will; there is nothing here about a "camp where they exterminate," there is here no "extermination camp" (an expression invented by the victors, some years after 1942, to designate camps allegedly endowed with "gas chambers"). What there is here in reality is an annihilation; men and women are reduced to wasting away; they are annihilated, reduced to nothing by the epidemics and notably by that illness whose name "typhus" (in Greek *tũpos*) signifies precisely: torpor, stupor, a kind of lethargy, a rapid destruction of the faculties, sometimes up to the point of death. Auschwitz is not "an extermination camp" (an anachronistic expression, and we know that anachronism is one of the most reliable signs of the presence of a falsehood) but the camp, yes, indeed, the camp *par excellence* of general annihilation. Without doubt, just as the moment of taking his post at Auschwitz, this newcomer, Dr. Kremer, had heard his colleagues say: "You know, this camp, they call it the camp of annihilation. Look out for typhus! You yourself also take the risk of contracting it and dying from it."

And, at the end of his entry for 2 September 1942, Dr. Kremer puts an exclamation point. That point indicates the doctor's emotion. If one conceals it, as does Wellers, the phrase takes on another tone: one would perhaps believe that the doctor is cruel and cynical. One would perhaps believe that Dr. Kremer coldly thought: "The Auschwitz camp is called an "extermination camp." So it is. It is indeed. Let us take things as they are." In reality, he is overwhelmed.

Due to lack of time, I cannot devote myself to the criticism of the texts given by Léon Poliakov, by Serge Klarsfeld, by the authorities of the State Museum of Oświęcim, by the official translation of document NO-3408, *etc.* I would only like to point out an especially serious fact. It concerns the German courts. The court at Münster which, in 1960 tried Dr. Kremer, quite simply skipped over the word *Draussen* when it reproduced the entry of 2 September 1942. It piled up other serious dishonesties. Here is an example of them: to overpower Dr. Kremer, the tribunal appealed to the "Calendar of Events at Auschwitz" as it was drawn up by

the Communist authorities in Poland. It is already strange that a court in the western world thus shows confidence in a document drawn up by Stalinists. But there is more. The courts have established that, for most of the convoys that arrived in the camp, the Polish in their "Calendar" indicated with extraordinary precision the number of persons "gassed." Since we know that, according to the Exterminationist standard literature the people "gassed" were not the object of any accounting, of any counting, an honest man could only be astonished to read in this "Calendar" that, from the time when Dr. Kremer was at Auschwitz, they had, on such and such a day, "gassed" 981 persons and, on another day, 1594 other persons. Also, the court at Münster cynically used a subterfuge. It reproduced in its text numerous citations of the "Calendar" and while making it clear that it was a question of this "Calendar," but. . .each time that the "Calendar" uses the word "*vergast*" ("gassed"), the court itself substituted for that clumsy word the word "*umgebracht*" ("killed"). Thus the reader of the judgement at Münster is deceived. Whoever might find it suspect that they can talk to him about "981 gassed" or about "1594 gassed", easily lets them talk to him about "981 dead" or about "1594 dead."

Finally, two remarks about the entries other than that of 2 September: (1) The expression *anus mundi* would not be appropriate, it seems to me, to scenes of "gassings" but rather to a repugnant and nauseating scene of groups of people fallen prey to disgusting diseases, to dysentery, etc. (2) When Dr. Kremer says that he was present at a special action in rainy, cold weather or in grey and rainy autumn weather, it is probable that those actions took place outside in the open air, and not in a gas chamber.

6. THE TRUTH OF THE TEXTS: AUSCHWITZ AS PREY TO EPIDEMICS DURING THE SUMMER OF 1942.

It is sufficient to read the diary with a minimum of good faith in order to see the evidence. Here is the complementary information that this diary gives us. I will summarize it. Dr. Kremer came to Auschwitz to replace a sick doctor there. Typhus had ravaged not only the camp, but also the German-Polish city of Auschwitz. Not only the internees

struck, but also the German troops. There was typhus, malaria, dysentery, tropical heat, innumerable flies, and dust. The water was dangerous to drink. Diarrhea, vomiting, stomach aches made the atmosphere stink. The scene of people reduced to nothing by typhus was demoralizing. In that hell, Dr. Kremer himself contracted what he called "the sickness of Auschwitz." However, he underwent several vaccinations, at first against exanthematic typhus, then against abdominal typhus (a name which, in itself, would explain very well the term *anus mundi*). The principal bearer of typhus is the louse. On 1 September 1942, he wrote: "In the afternoon was present at the gassing of a block with *Zyklon B* against lice." *Zyklon B* is stabilized hydrocyanic acid. That product is still used today throughout the entire world. Many documents prove to us that that disinfection operation was delicate and could demand the presence of a doctor to bring help, should the occasion arise, to certified personnel charged with carrying out the gassing of a barrack and, 21 hours after the beginning of the airing out of such a barrack, testing for the disappearance of the hydrocyanic acid before permitting people to return to live in their barracks. On 10 October 1942, the situation was so serious that, for everyone, there was a quarantine of the camp. The wife of the *Obersturmführer* or *Sturmbannführer* Cäsar died of typhus. All of the city of Auschwitz was in bed, *etc.* It is sufficient to refer to the text of the diary. For more details of that epidemic of the year 1942, one can also consult the calendar of the *Hefte von Auschwitz* (year 1942). In the *Anthology of the International Auschwitz Committee*, Volume I, second part, page 196 (in the French edition), we read that the SS physician Dr. Popiersch, head doctor of the garrison and of the camp, had died of typhus on 24 April 1942 (four months before the arrival of Dr. Kremer). In Volume II, first part, published also in 1969, we read on page 129 and in note 14 on page 209 that the Polish physician Dr. Marian Ciepielowski of Warsaw also died of typhus while caring for the Soviet prisoners of war.

The work of Dr. Kremer at Auschwitz seems to have been principally to devote himself to laboratory research, to dissections, to anatomical studies. But it was also necessary for him to be present at some corporal punishments and

some executions. He was not present at the very arrival of the convoys, but, once the division between those fit for work and those not fit for work had been made, he arrived, in a car with driver, from his hotel room in Auschwitz (room #26 at the Train Station Hotel). What took place then? Did he lead people into some "gas chambers" or to disinfection? Let us see below what they claim that he said first in 1947 to the Polish communists; secondly, in 1960 to the court at Münster; and thirdly, in 1964 to the court at Frankfurt.

7. THE TRUTH OF THE TEXTS: NO "GASSING."

We recall that, in his diary, on the date of 12 October 1942, Dr. Kremer wrote:

> [. . .] Was present at night at another special action with a draft from Holland (1600 persons). Horrible scene in front of the last bunker! This was the 10th special action.

In the same manner, on 18 October he wrote:

> In wet and cold weather was on this Sunday morning present at the 11th special action (from Holland). Terrible scenes when 3 women begged to have their bare lives spared.

These two texts are easy to intrepret. The "last bunker" could only be the bunker of barracks #11; it was located at the end of the camp of Auschwitz (the original camp) and not at Birkenau or near Birkenau which is 3 km. away. The executions took place in what they called the courtyard of block 11. It is there that is located the "black wall." It happened usually that persons condemned to death were transported into a concentration camp to be executed there. Such was probably the case with the three women who came from the Netherlands. I suppose that it would be easy to find their names and the motives for their condemnation either in the archives at Auschwitz or in those of the Historical Institute in Amsterdam. In either case, these three women were shot.

The Polish have been terribly embarrassed by this reference to the "last bunker." By a sleight of hand they have

converted this bunker which is in the singular into. . .peasant farms allegedly transformed into "gas chambers" and located near Birkenau. And there the absurdities pile up. What is the doctor supposed to have done? NOTHING. He remained seated in his car, at a distance. And what did he see of a "gassing" of human beings? NOTHING. What can he tell us about what took place after the alleged "gassing"? NOTHING, since he left by car with his driver (and the medical orderly?). He is not able to talk either about the installation, nor about the processing of putting to death, nor about the personnel employed in this putting to death, nor of the precautions taken to enter into an incredibly dangerous place. It is not Dr. Kremer who will tell us how some men would be able to enter into this terrible place "A SHORT MOMENT" after the alleged victims finished crying out. It is not he who will be able to let us know by what secret means they were able to pull out some thousands of bodies saturated with cyanide lying amidst vapors of hydrocynanic acid, and all that done with bare hands (although that acid poisons by contact with the skin), without gas masks (although this gas is overwhelming), while eating and smoking (although this gas is inflammable and explosive). It is Rudolf Höss, in his spontaneous confessions to the same Polish court, who recounted all of those astonishing things. Let's be decent about this. Let us suppose that the members of the *Sonderkommando* (Special Detachment) nevertheless did possess some gas masks, provided with the particularly strong filter, the J filter, against hydrocyanic acid. I am afraid that we are no further ahead. I have in fact here, in front of me, a text from a technical manual of the American army, translated from the text of an American manual dating from 1943 (*The Gas Mask*, technical manual No. 3-205, War Department, Washington, 9 October 1941, a manual prepared under the direction of the Chief of the Chemical Warfare Service, U.S. Printing Office, 1941, 144 pages.) Here is what is written on page 55 (I write the most important words in CAPITALS):

> It should also be remembered that a man may be overcome by the absorption of hydrocyanic gas through the skin; a concentration of 2 percent hydrocyanic acid gas being sufficient

> to thus overcome a man in about 10 minutes. Therefore, EVEN IF ONE WEARS A GAS MASK, exposure to concentrations of hydrocyanic gas of 1 percent by volume or greater should be made only in case of necessity and then FOR A PERIOD NO LONGER THAN 1 MINUTE AT A TIME. In general, places containing this gas should be well ventilated with fresh air before the wearer of the mask enters, thus reducing the concentration of hydrocyanic gas to low fractional percentages.

The spontaneous confessions of Dr. Kremer with those closures "provided with a sliding door for secure closing" make us laugh. The total airtightness demanded by a homicidal gas chamber using hydrocyanic acid would be impossible to achieve with a sliding door. But how could Dr. Kremer, who had never left his car, describe that door as if he had seen it? And the SS man who released the gas—how did he do it? Did he release "the contents of a box of *Zyklon* through an opening in the wall" (version of the confession of 1947)? Or "by some shafts (*Einwurfschächte*)" (version of 1960)? Or indeed through a "dormer window" that he reached "above" while going up "by a ladder" (version of 1964)? Everything in these confessions is empty and vague. One can simply deduce from them with certainty two things which are quite probable:

(1) Dr. Kremer convoyed some people who were led into some barracks in order to undress (and without doubt they next went to disinfection or to the showers);

(2) Dr. Kremer was present at some gassings of buildings or of barracks for their disinfection by *Zyklon B*.

It was while helping himself by the combining of these two real experiences that he constructed for his accusers or his accusers constructed for him the poor and absurd account of the "gas chambers." A very characteristic point of the false testimonies regarding the homicidal "gassings" is the following: the accused says that he was at a certain distance from the place of the crime; the most that one can find is a defendant who said that he had been forced to release the *Zyklon* through a hole in the roof of the "gas

chamber" or even one who "had helped push" the victims into the "gas chamber." That ought to remind us of the unfortunates who in the Middle Ages were accused of having met the devil on such and such a day, at such and such an hour, in such and such a place. They would have been able to deny it fiercely. They would have been able to go so far as to say: "You know very well that I could not have met with the devil for one excellent reason, which is that the devil does not exist." The unfortunates would have condemned themselves by such responses. They had only one way out: to play the game of their accusers, to admit that the devil was there without doubt, but. . .at the top of the hill, while they themselves, located below, heard the horrible *noise* (sobs, groans, cries, racket) made by the victims of the devil. It is shameful that in the middle of the 20th century there are found so many judges and also so many lawyers who will admit as evidence the bewildering confessions of so many accused persons without having ever had the least curiosity to ask them what they had really seen, seen with their own eyes, without posing to them some technical questions, without going on to some comparisons between the most obviously contradictory explanations. Unfortunately I must say in their defense that even some intelligent technicians and even some well-informed chemists imagine that almost any small place can easily be transformed into a homicidal "gas chamber." None of those people has had the chance to visit an American gas chamber. They would understand the enormity of their error. The first Americans who thought about executing a condemned man by gas also imagined that it would be easy. It was when they tried to actually do it that they understood that they risked gassing not only the condemned man but also the governor and the employees of the penitentiary. They needed many years to perfect a nearly reliable gas chamber.

As to the "special actions" of Dr. Kremer, they are easy to understand. It is simply a question of what, in the vocabulary of the French Army, is called by the pompous name of "*missions extraordinaires.*" I believe that the American equivalent is "special assignment." A "special assignment" does not imply necessarily that there is a moving of the person. It is a question of a sudden assignment which comes

to break the habitual unfolding of his duties. Dr. Kremer, for example, worked especially in the laboratory but, from time to time, he was required for extra work: reception of a convoy to be led to disinfection, sorting out the contagious or the sick in the hospital, etc. It is thus that as a good military man and as an orderly man he noted in his diary each of those tasks which were, probably, each time worth a supplementary allowance to him, as to the SS volunteers who cleaned the railroad cars at the arrival of each convoy. In any case, if Auschwitz appeared to him like a hell, it was not at all because of frightful crimes like the executions of crowds of human beings in the enclosures allegedly turned into "gas chambers," but because of the typhus, malaria, dysentery, the infernal heat, the flies, the lice, the dust. One can determine that by a slightly attentive reading of the very text of his diary. That is what I, for my part, did first. And then, one day, I fell by chance upon the proof, the material proof, that such was indeed the correct interpretation.

8. TEXTUAL CONFIRMATION OF THE CORRECTNESS OF THE REVISIONIST INTREPRETATION OF THE DIARY OF DR. KREMER

On page 42 of *Justiz und NS-Verbrechen* we learn that in the trial at Münster, in 1960, Dr. Kremer had had someone appear as a witness for his defense. That witness was a woman whose name began with Gla. (German law authorizes that, in a public document, certain names may be revealed only in abridged form.) That name was very probably that of Miss Glaser, the daughter of Dr. Kremer's housekeeper; one about whom he speaks on several occasions in his diary. The witness brought to the court some post cards and some letters that the doctor had sent to her at the time of his stay in Auschwitz. The witness said that the doctor "had not been in agreement with what took place at Auschwitz" and that he had hurried to leave the camp. Miss Gla[ser] then put into evidence a letter of 21 October 1942 that Dr. Kremer had sent to her. The content of it is of extreme importance, which apparently eluded the tribunal. It proves that, when Dr. Kremer spoke of the Auschwitz camp as a hell, it was indeed as I have said, because of the

typhus and the other epidemics. Here are the very words used by the doctor in his letter:

> I don't really know for certain, but I expect, however, that I'll be able to be in Münster before 1 December, and thus finally turn my back on this hell of Auschwitz where, in addition to the typhoid, and so on, typhus has once again broken out strongly. . .

Here is therefore that "Dante's Inferno" from the entry of 2 September 1942! Professor of Medicine Johann Paul Kremer had seen the horrors of a formidable epidemic at Auschwitz wiping out internees and guards; he had not seen monstrous "gassing" operations, exterminating crowds of human beings.

9. THE HUMAN CHARACTER OF DR. KREMER

In considering his life and reading his diary, we perceive that Dr. Kremer was absolutely not a brute, or a fanatic or a cynical human being. He was human, too human; he was a free spirit but perhaps without great courage. He had quickly become a sort of "old boy" attached above all to his profession. In the first pages of Volume XVII of *Justiz und NS-Verbrechen* his biography is sketched out. Johann Paul Kremer was born in 1883 near Cologne of a father who, after having been a miller, became a peasant. He did his advanced studies at the Universities of Heidelberg, Strasbourg and Berlin. He obtained a doctorate in philosophy and a doctorate in medicine. He worked in succession at the Charité Hospital in Berlin, at the hospital of Berlin-Neukoln, at the surgical clinic of the University of Bonn, at the anatomical institute of the same university; finally, he became a deputy lecturer at the University of Münster; he gave courses there up until 1945 (when he was 62 years old). Those courses dealt with the doctrine of heredity, sports medicine, X-rays, and especially anatomy. In 1932, at the age of 48, he joined the National-Socialist Party. In 1936, at the age of 52, he was made *SS-Sturmmann* (soldier of the first class). In 1941, at the age of 57, he was promoted to *Untersturmführer* (second lieutenant) in the *Waffen-SS*. He served his active duty. He was in the service only at the

time of university vacations. In 1942 he spent two months at Dachau as a doctor attached to the SS hospital; he had not contact with the camp of the internees. In 1941, at the age of 57, he published a paper on heredity which seems to have brought him some worries in regard to the official authorities. In August of 1942, he was serving at the SS hospital in Prague when, suddenly, he received an assignment for Auschwitz to replace a doctor who had fallen ill there. He stayed at Auschwitz from 30 August to 18 November 1942, and then he resumed his activity at the anatomical institute of the city of Münster. He was 58 years old. He served as the president of the Discipline Commission of North Westphalia of the Union of National Socialist Doctors. In 1943, he was named Lieutenant in the reserves of the *Waffen-SS*. Here is how he was judged:

> Calm personality, correct; sure of himself, energetic; above the average in general culture; excellent understanding of his specialty. Lengthy education as surgeon and anatomist; since 1936, deputy lecturer at the Univeristy of Münster.

On 12 August 1945, he was arrested at his home in Münster by the British occupying forces (the "automatic arrest" of former SS men). They seized his diary at his home. He was interned at Neuengamme, then turned over to the Poles. He was imprisoned at Stettin, then in succession in fourteen Polish prisons, then finally in the prison at Cracow. The preliminary investigation of the case was carried out by the famous judge Jan Sehn, the same one to whom we owe the interrogations of Rudolf Höss and the confession, "spontaneous" no doubt, of Rudolf Höss. In 1947, at the age of nearly 64 years, he was freed for good conduct, because of his advanced age and since he was ill. He returned to his home, at Münster. He was arrested on the order of the German court, then freed on bail. At the time he was receiving a pension of DM 70 per week. He had married in 1920, at the age of 37, but he was separated from his wife at the end of two months since she suffered from schizophrenia. He had not been able to obtain a divorce until twenty years later, in 1942. Dr. Kremer did not have any children. A housekeeper took care of him. Unless I am mistaken, he was never at the front nor did he ever fire a shot, except, without doubt, in

training. He kept his diary beginning at the age of 15½. I have not read the part of his diary prior to the Second World War. On 29 November 1960 Dr. Kremer, age 76, was condemned to ten years in prison but those ten years were considered as purged. In consideration of his advanced age, his civil rights were only cancelled for five years. He was condemned to pay the court costs, he was deprived of his responsibility as course attaché, deprived of his title of professor and deprived, I believe, of his two doctorates. On 4 June 1964 he came to the witness stand in the "Frankfurt Trial" to testify against the "Auschwitz guards." I doubt that this old man of 80 years thus came spontaneously to make charges against his compatriots in the hysterical atmosphere of this famous witch trial. His "spontaneous confessions" to the Polish communists were thus, to the end of his existence, to cling to his skin like the tunic of Nessus. It was thus that beginning in 1945 the existence of this professor had become a drama. Here therefore is a man who had devoted his life to relieving the sufferings of his fellow men: the drama of a war lost and then he was made officially a sort of monster who had, it seemed, suddenly devoted two and one-half months of his life to gigantic massacres of human beings according to a truly Satanical industrial method.

The diary of Dr. Kremer is dull in style (at least that part that I have read) but when one considers what was the destiny of that diary and of its author, one cannot prevent oneself from thinking of it as a work which, very much more than some highly valued historical or literary testimonies, is profoundly upsetting. I think often of that old man. I think sometimes also of his tormentors. I do not know what became of Dr. Kremer. If he were still alive today, he would be 97 years old. I hope that one day a student will write a biography of this man and that to do so he will visit the city of Münster (Westphalia) where there certainly still live some people who knew—permit me to return to him his titles—Professor Doctor Johann Paul Kremer.

Dr. Kremer certainly did not have National Socialist convictions. On 13 January 1943 he wrote in his diary: "There is no Aryan, Negroid, Mongoloid or Jewish science, only a true or a false one." On the same date, he furthermore wrote this:

> [. . .] I had never even dreamed there existed anything like "a gagged science." By such manoeuvres, science has received a mortal blow and has been banished from the country! The situation in Germany today is not any better than in the times when Galileo had been forced to recant and when science had been threatened by tortures and the stake. Where, for Heaven's sake, is that situation going to lead us to in the twentieth century!!! I could almost feel ashamed to be a German. And so shall I have to end my days as the victim of science and the fanatic of truth.

In reality, he was to end his days as the victim of the political lie and as a poor man obliged to lie.

At the date of 1 March 1943, we read in his diary:

> Went today to shoemaker Grevsmühl to be registered and saw there a leaflet sent him from Kattowitz by the Socialist Party of Germany. The leaflet informed that we had already liquidated 2 million Jews, by shooting or gassing.

The Exterminationist historians do not use the argument that this passage of the diary seems to furnish them. On reflection, that is understandable. Every one knows well that a thousand rumors of German atrocities circulated during the war. The socialist opposition made use of them, as did all of the opponents of Hitler. In this type of tract one says anything and everything. That is the rule for that type of work. Dr. Kremer made no commentary on that pamphlet. Perhaps he believed in what the author of the tract stated. It is even probable since he took the trouble to note it. That is precisely what is interesting about this incident. Dr. Kremer must certainly not have been a very good Nazi, or otherwise his shoemaker would not have run the risk of making him read a secret pamphlet, and especially a pamphlet "which had been addressed to him." This last detail indeed proves that Dr. Kremer did not fear to confide to his diary very delicate information.

On 26 July 1945, or about two and one half months after the German surrender, Dr. Kremer witnessed the distress of his fellow countrymen. That distress wrung from him nearly the same words as did the horrors of Auschwitz. I present in *italic* type those words in the quotation that

follows:

> The *weather* is still *very hot and dry*. The corn ripens before its time, *gnats are pestering us more and more*, the foreigners* are still greatly worrying the *starving, needy and homeless inhabitants*. People are *crowded into goods trains like cattle* pushed hither and thither, while at night they try to find shelter in *the stench of dirty and verminous bunkers*. *Quite indescribable* is the fate of these poor refugees, driven into uncertainty by *death, hunger and despair*.
>
> *(The Polish authorities here have altered the original German text, which spoke not of "foreigners" but of "Russians, Poles and Italians.")

The fact that immediately after this passage Dr. Kremer spoke about the gathering of berries does not mean that he was insensitive to the suffering of his fellow countrymen. Anyone who keeps a diary passes in this way, without transition, from the serious to the trifling. After the death of a person dear to him, Goethe noted something to the effect: "Death of Christiane!! I slept well. I feel better." And this "better" referred to health—his own health—which up until then had given him some concern. As to Kafka, I believe that I recall that on that day he had gone to the swimming pool. I am not sure of these quotations and I propose to verify them one day.

10. FORCED CONFESSIONS

We all know that forced confessions are common coinage, especially in time of war. The GIs in Korea, as in Vietnam, did not fail to confess "spontaneously" to the worst absurdities. People often believe that "spontaneous confessions" are a specialty of the Communist world. That ignores the fact that the French, British and Americans made great use of torture towards, for example, the conquered of the last war. As regards what the French did, I have carried out an investigation of an almost surgical precision on the summary executions in a whole small region of France at the time of the Liberation in 1944. It is absolutely impossible to have my manuscript published,

given the scandal that it would cause and that would have repercussions, I can tell you, right up to the Presidency of the Republic, which is opposed (imagine it!) to the exhumation of people who were executed by units of the *Maquis*. Those people were sometimes tortured. But experience has also taught me that it is necessary to distrust some tales of physical torture. There are some perverted persons who take a real pleasure in inventing all sorts of stories of that kind. In *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, on pages 188-192, Dr. Butz presents a profound and suggestive analysis of forced confessions and torture. His brilliant intelligence, not to say his genius, dictates to him sometimes, as you well know, observations of such great pertinence that one is astonished and is ashamed not to have made them oneself. Here is an example of that, dealing with physical torture; it is not lacking in humor:

> Finally we should observe that almost none of us, certainly not this author, has ever experienced torture at the hands of professionals bent on a specific goal, and thus we might suspect, to put it quite directly, that we simply do not know what we are talking about when we discuss the possibilities of torture. (page 192)

It is, I think, easy to obtain forced confessions from a man whom one holds at his mercy. Physical torture is not absolutely necessary. I mean to say that it is not absolutely necessary to strike the victim. It is sufficient sometimes to shout and to threaten. A seclusion and a prolonged isolation, as was the case with Aldo Moro, can create a feeling of panic and lead to a sort of madness. One will be prepared to sign any kind of declaration in order to get out of there. If an officer refuses a confession, he can be threatened with losing his men, and vice versa. They will threaten him with losing his wife and his children. I am sure that all physical or mental resistance can be wiped out by very simple means. For example, they will offer a prisoner conditions of lodging worthy of a decent hotel and will give him as much as he wishes to eat, but. . .they will give him nothing to drink. Or indeed he will have enough to eat and to drink, but they will light his cell day and night with such power (see the example of Nürnberg) that he will no longer be able to

sleep. Very quickly he will become a human rag prepared to mutter any kind of confession.

One fearful effect of torture is to bring the victim closer to his torturer. The panting victim detaches himself in thought from those whom he ought to love in order to attach himself to the one whom he ought to fear and hate. He no longer wishes to have anything in common with those whose ideas he shares: he comes to hate those ideas and those people because those ideas, finally, have cost him too much suffering and those people—his friends—appear to him as a living reproach. To the contrary, there is everything to expect from the torturer. He is in possession of power, which always, in spite of everything, enjoys a certain prestige. The gods are on his side. It is he who possesses the solution to all your sufferings. The torturer is going to propose to you this solution when, if he wished, he could kill you on the spot or torture you without respite. That torturer, who proposes that you sign a simple sheet of paper on which some words are written, he is good. How can you resist him when you feel yourself to be so weak and so alone? That torturer becomes irresistible when, in place of demanding from you a confession that is precise and totally contrary to the truth, he proposes to you a sort of compromise: a vague confession based on a partial truth. In 1963-1965, at the Frankfurt trial, the judge of the tribunal had as his first concern not the truth, since he thought that the truth had already been completely found, but the measuring of THE DEGREE OF REPENTANCE of each of the accused! On page 512 of the book by Hermann Langbein, cited above, we see the judge show his preoccupation with discerning to what degree the accused Pery Broad had a feeling of Evil: he declared in all candor: "You see, an awarness of wrong doing plays a large part in this proceeding." How many times must the German defendants have heard that remark from the mouths of their jailers, their investigating magistrates, and especially from their lawyers! After that, how would an intelligent and sensible man like Pery Broad refuse to tell the stupid story about an anonymous SS man whom he is supposed to have noticed one day, from a distance, in the process of releasing a mysterious liquid through the opening of the ceiling of. . .the "gas chamber"

of Auschwitz (the original camp)? Pery Broad probably knew that no one would come to ask him, among other questions:

> But how could you know that that was the ceiling of a "gas chamber" and not of a morgue? Did you enter into the place? If you did, can you tell us how it was arranged? Is it not mad on the part of the Germans to have placed a "gas chamber" just under the windows of that SS hospital and under the windows of the administrative building where you found yourself on that day? The evacuation of vapor from the hydrocyanic gas would therefore have been directed toward the SS men of the hospital or the SS men of the administration? Isn't that so?

Such are the questions that the tribunal *did not* ask Pery Broad.

It would be inhuman to reproach Pery Broad, Dr. Kremer, Rudolf Höss, and some SS men again for their absurd forced confessions. One must be astonished at the laughable number of those confessions when one thinks of the hundreds of SS men from the concentration camps who were imprisoned by the Allies. Among all those who were hanged or shot or who committed suicide, how many left confessions? A handful regarding the subject of the alleged "gas chambers." In regard to other subjects, perhaps there are more numerous confessions. I am led to believe that the Polish and the Soviets must have obtained a crowd of confessions; the SS men had to charge each other as all the men of the same lost-cause were more or less obliged to do. If there were very few confessions from the SS men concerning the "gas chambers," it was not thanks to the courage of the SS men—since, once again, it seems to me that no one can truly resist a torturer who is something of a psychologist—but quite simply because, on this subject, their torturers did not know very well what to make them state precisely. Not having any material reality on which to construct their lies about the "gas chambers"—those slaughterhouses which in fact never existed—the torturers were reduced to inventing some poor things and some stereotypes that they attributed to people like Rudolf Höss, Pery Broad and Johann Paul Kremer.

11. A PRACTICAL CONCLUSION

In conclusion, if, in your presence, an Exterminationist should base his thesis about the reality of the "gas chambers" of Auschwitz or of any other camp on the argument of some confessions, here, in my opinion, is the conduct to follow:

1. Ask if he will first enumerate those confessions one by one;
2. Ask him to point out the confession which, in his opinion, is the most convincing;
3. Agree to read that one confession in the language (accessible for you) and in the form that, again, your questioner will freely choose;
4. Compare the supposedly original text of that confession with the text that your questioner will have furnished to you;
5. Decipher that text line by line and word by word, without making it say either more or less than it does say; note carefully what the author of the confession alleges that he personally saw, heard or did; a traditional trick of the German courts has consisted, as was the case for the judgement of Johann Paul Kremer at Münster in 1960, in slipping a weak confession that the accused made into a very long presentation about "gassing" in such a way that the reader believes that the whole report comes from the accused; the reader imagines that the accused made a detailed report of the events; it is nothing of the kind; it is necessary to "scour" from the text all of the contributions of the judge in order to make the judgement that the testimony is nearly as inconsistent as it is brief and vague.
6. See if the confession stands up, if it is coherent, if it does not break any law of physics or of elementary chemistry; be very materialistic, as if you had to study a miracle from Lourdes; try to see the places where the action is said to have taken place; see what remains of it; some ruins can be very instructive; seek out the plans of the places or of the buildings;
7. See, possibly, if the text of the confession is in the

handwriting of the man who confessed; see if this text is in his mother tongue or in another language; the Allies usually made the Germans sign texts drawn up in French (Josef Kramer) or in English (Rudolf Höss) and they added in all peace of conscience that they guaranteed that this text had been translated to the accused in his own language, very faithfully (and that besides in the absence of any lawyer);

8. Seek to know who obtained that confession, when and how; ask yourself the question: upon whom did the man who confessed depend for drinking, for eating and for sleeping?

I do not think that I need to add other recommendations (for example, as to the material or documentary authenticity of the text to be studied). You understood that I am setting out a method of investigation that is elementary and not at all original. It is a routine method that one would apply automatically if it were a question of ordinary criminal matters which are exceptional by their supposed nature, very far from redoubling prudence and making appeal to a proven method, they display an incredible lightness. The good method always consists when it is a question of an inquest, of an analysis or of whatever work, of "beginning with the beginning." In fact, experience has taught me that often nothing is more difficult and less spontaneous than "to begin with the beginning." It is only after some years of research on the "gas chambers" and after having pronounced those words "gas chambers" perhaps several thousands of times that one fine day I woke up with the following question: "But in fact, what indeed can those words signify? To what material reality can they indeed relate?" To ask those questions was to very quickly find in them an answer. That answer you know: it is that the homicidal "gas chambers" of the Germans were only born in sick minds. It is time that the entire world wakes up and realizes this. Germany, in particular, ought to wake up from this frightful nightmare. It is time that a truthful history of the Second World War be written.

NOTES

I reproduce here the text of the entry of 2 September 1942 (Diary of Johann Paul Kremer) after the photocopy of the original as it is found in the National Archives in Washington (Doc. #NO-3408). Some Exterminationist works reproduce the photograph of this entry among other entries from the diary. But the reader has little chance to go about deciphering each word of the German handwriting of Dr. Kremer. He will be inclined to have confidence in the printed reproduction that they will propose to him, for example, in the margin; that is the case with *KL Auschwitz, Arbeit Macht Frei*, edited by the International Auschwitz Committee, 96 pages (not dated). On page 48 there appears a photograph of a manuscript page of the diary on which are found three entries relating to five dates (1 through 5 September 1942). In the margin, you discover the alleged printed reproduction of the single entry of 2 September. That reproduction appears in French, English and German. In French and English the text is outrageously distorted. In German, it was very difficult to distort the text in a similar way since the photocopy of the manuscript is available to the reader. But we must have unlimited confidence that the Exterminationists will falsify texts that embarrass them. The International Auschwitz Committee has found a solution thanks to a typographical trick. After the word *Sonderaktion* the authors of the book have printed in the same typeface the following parenthesis, as if it were from Dr. Kremer: "*So wurde die Selektion und das Vergasen genannt*" ("Thus did they refer to selection and gassing"). Either the reader, as is highly probable, will not notice the difference between the manuscript text and the printed text and then will believe it to be a confidence imparted by Dr. Kremer, which will appear to him to be all the more normal since, according to an Exterminationist myth, the Nazis spent their time inventing a coded language in order to cover up their crimes; or else the reader will see the difference between the texts and then the authors will plead a simple and innocent typographical error. Serge Klarsfeld, as I said above, has used this fallacious page in his *Memorial of the Deportation of the Jews from France*. It is thus

that historical tricks are spread and perpetuated. Here is the original manuscript text in its authentic form:

> *Zum 1. Male draussen um 3 Uhr früh bei einer Sonderaktion zugegen. Im Vergleich hierzu erscheint mir das Dante' sche Inferno fast wie eine Komödie. Umsonst wird Auschwitz nicht das Lager der Vernichtung genannt!*

Finally, here is the text of the passage from the letter of 21 October 1942 addressed to Miss Gla[ser]:

> [. . .] *Definitiven Bescheid habe ich allerdings noch nicht erwarte jedoch, dass ich vor dem 1. Dezember wieder in Münster sein kann and so endgultig dieser Hölle Auschwitz den Rükken gekehrt habe, wo ausser Fleck usw. sich nunmehr auch der Typhus mächtig bemerkbar macht. . .*

I reproduce the text with its errors in punctuation and spelling.

The Civil War Concentration Camps

MARK WEBER

No aspect of the American Civil War left behind a greater legacy of bitterness and acrimony than the treatment of prisoners of war. "Andersonville" still conjures up images of horror unmatched in American History. And although Northern partisans still invoke the infamous Southern camp to defame the Confederacy, the Union had its share of equally horrific camps. Prison camps on both sides produced scenes of wretched, disease-ridden and emaciated prisoners as repulsive as any to come out of the Second World War.

Partisans in both the North and the South produced wildly exaggerated novels, reminiscences of prisoners, journalistic accounts and even official government reports which charged the enemy with wanton criminal policies of murderous intent. It took several decades for Revisionist historians to separate fact from propagandistic fancy and deliberate distortion from misunderstanding. Even today the bitter legacy of hate lingers on in widespread but often grossly distorted accounts from this tragic chapter of American history.

Neither side deliberately set out to maltreat prisoners. Arrangements were made hurriedly to deal with unexpected masses of men. As neither side expected the war to last long, these measures were only makeshifts undertaken with minimum expenditure. Management was bad on both sides, but worse in the South owing to poorer, more decentralized organization and more meager resources. Thus, prisoners held by the Union were somewhat better off.

In the first phase of the war, 1861-1862, the relatively small numbers of prisoners taken by both sides were well treated. Both sides agreed to a prisoner exchange arrangement which operated during the latter half of 1862. Under the cartel, captives remaining after the exchanges

were paroled. But the agreement broke down, in part because of Northern refusal to recognize the Confederate authorities as anything other than "rebels," and in part over the Negro question.

"In a war of this kind, words are things. If we must address Davis as president of the Confederacy, we cannot exchange and the prisoners should not wish it," declared the influential *Harper's Weekly*.

Following the promulgation of the Emancipation Proclamation on New Year's Day, 1863, the North began enlisting former slaves into the Federal army. Confederate President Jefferson Davis declared that "all Negro slaves captured in arms" and their White officers should be delivered over to the South to be dealt with according to law. That could mean rigorous prosecution under strict laws relating to Negro insurrections.

Still, special exchanges on a reduced scale continued, but from 1863 onwards, both sides were holding large numbers of prisoners.

On 17 April 1864, General Grant ordered that no more Confederate prisoners were to be paroled or exchanged until there were released a sufficient number of Union officers and men to equal the parolees at Vicksburg and Port Hudson and unless the Confederate authorities would agree to make no distinction whatsoever between White and Negro prisoners.

On 10 August, the Confederate government offered to exchange officer for officer and man for man, accompanying the proposal with a statement on conditions at Andersonville. This offer induced General Grant to reveal his real reason for refusing any further exchanges. "Every man we hold, when released on parole or otherwise," Grant reported to Washington, "becomes an active soldier against us at once either directly or indirectly. If we commence a system of exchange which liberates all prisoners taken, we will have to fight on until the whole South is exterminated. If we hold those caught they amount to no more than dead men. At this particular time to release all rebel prisoners North would insure Sherman's defeat and would compromise our safety here." (Rhodes, pp499-500)

In October, Lee proposed to Grant another man-to-man exchange of prisoners. Grant asked whether Lee would turn

over Negro troops "the same as White soldiers?" When Lee declared that "Negroes belonging to our citizens are not considered subjects of exchange," the negotiations completely broke down.

After the cessation of prisoner exchanges under the cartel, the camps of the South became crowded and the growing poverty of the Confederacy resulted in excessive suffering in the Southern stockades. Reports about these conditions in the Northern press created the belief that the ill treatment was part of a deliberate policy. The inevitable war hatred made such a belief readily credible.

After the war, Confederate partisans laid responsibility for camp conditions (on both sides) at the feet of the Federal authorities. They pointed to the Northern cancellation of the parole and exchange cartel which put a heavy and unexpected strain on the Southern prisoner program. They also condemned the North for its deliberate cut in rations for Confederate prisoners as a reaction to reports of bad conditions in the Southern camps.

The best known of all the Civil War camps today is Andersonville. Officially designated Camp Sumter, the prison stockade was located in south-central Georgia, about 20 miles from Plains. More than 45 000 Union soldiers were confined there between February 1864, when the first prisoners arrived, and April 1865, when it was captured. Of these, 12 912 died, about 28 percent of the total, and were buried on the camp grounds, now a National Cemetery. (Baker, p10)

Andersonville was a prison for enlisted soldiers. After the first few months, officers were confined at Macon. The camp was originally designed to hold 10 000 men, but by late June that number had jumped to 26 000. By August the 26½ acre camp was holding over 32 000 soldiers. Overcrowding continued to remain a serious problem. Guards kept watch from sentry boxes and shot any prisoner who crossed a wooden railing called the "deadline." A strip of ground between the "deadline" and the palisades was called the "deadrun."

The Confederates lacked necessary tools for adequate housing. Some of the early prisoners were able to construct a few rude huts of scrap wood. Many more sought shelter in dilapidated tents. Others dug holes in the ground for protec-

tion, but hundreds had no shelter of any kind against the pouring rain, southern heat and winter cold.

No clothing was provided, and many prisoners who were transferred to Andersonville from other camps were dressed only in rags. Even decent clothing deteriorated quickly, and some prisoners had virtually nothing to wear.

The prisoners received the same daily ration as the guards: one and one-fourth pound of corn meal and either one pound of beef or one-third pound of bacon. The meager diet was only occasionally supplemented with beans, rice, peas or molasses. Northern soldiers were unused to this ration. But Southern troopers had fought long and hard on the usual fare of "hog and hominy."

A stream flowed through the treeless stockade, dividing it roughly in half. It quickly became polluted with waste, creating a horrible stench over the whole camp.

Almost *30 percent* of the prisoners confined to Andersonville during the camp's 13 month existence died there. Most succumbed to dysentery, gangrene, diarrhea and scurvy. The Confederates lacked adequate facilities, personnel and medical supplies to arrest the diseases. An average of more than 900 prisoners died each month. The poorly-equipped and -staffed camp hospital was woefully inadequate to deal with the wretched conditions. Confederate surgeon Joseph Jones called Andersonville "a giant mass of human misery."

Thieves and murderers among the prisoners stole food and clothing from their comrades. The most notorious were part of a large, organized group called the "Andersonville Raiders" which held sway within the stockade for nearly four months. Robberies and murders were daily occurrences until six of the ringleaders were caught and hanged. Other members of the Raiders were forced to run a gauntlet of club-wielding prisoners.

The camp guard force consisted of four regiments of the Georgia militia, generally made up of undisciplined older men and untrained young men. Efforts by the camp commander to replace them with more seasoned soldiers remained futile since every able-bodied man was needed to meet Gen. Sherman's troops advancing toward Atlanta.

Prisoners on both sides were held in some 150 prison camps. And while Andersonville is the best remembered,

several others equalled or even surpassed the Georgia camp in squalor and deadliness.

Some 12 000 Union soldiers were confined at Richmond in several centers, the worst of which was Belle Isle, a low-lying island on the James River. Less than half of the 6000 prisoners could seek shelter in tents; most slept on the ground without clothing or blankets. Many had no pants, shirts or shoes, and went without fuel or soap. At least ten men died a day in vermin-ridden conditions of inexpressible filthiness. The entire surface of the island compound became saturated with putrid waste matter. Hospitals for the prisoners in Richmond quickly became overcrowded and many died on Belle Isle without ever having seen a doctor.

Rations were meager indeed. Christmas Day, 1863, saw the prisoners without rations of any kind. The daily ration of a pound of bread and a half-pound of beef was steadily reduced. Bread gave way to cornbread of unsifted meal. One small sweet potato replaced the meat. For the last two weeks of captivity the entire daily ration consisted of three-fourths of a pound of cornbread.

The Confederate diet was hardly better. A Confederate official declared that the prisoners in Richmond were given the same rations as the Southern troops and that if the food was inadequate, it was due to the destructive warfare being waged by the North. Confederate soldiers in Richmond went without meat by January 1864. Severe shortages in the Southern capital brought astronomical food prices and bread riots.

The camps at Salisbury, North Carolina, and elsewhere reproduced the worst features of Andersonville on a smaller scale. A lack of water at Salisbury brought conditions of filth and unbearable stench. The daily ration there for both prisoner and guard was soup and twenty ounces of bread without meat or sorghum. Many interness lacked clothing or shelter and "muggers" among the prisoners robbed their comrades. The disease rate soared. From October 1864 to February 1865, 3479 prisoners died out of the 10 321 confined there, or over one third of the total. (Hesseltine, 1964, p170)

Conditions in the North were little better. One of the worst of the Union camps was Ft. Delaware, located on an island about 14 miles south of Wilmington. The filth and

vermin in the damp fortress prison encouraged a high death rate. Most of the 2436 Confederate prisoners who died in what some called "The Andersonville of the North" succumbed to scurvy and dysentery.

Another infamous Union camp was Rock Island, located on an island in the Mississippi River between Davenport, Iowa, and Rock Island, Illinois. A report in the New York *Daily News* of 3 January 1865 stated that the Confederate prisoners were reduced to eating dogs and rats, and that many were virtually naked and without adequate protection against the chilling winter cold. Recalcitrant prisoners were subject to a variety of imaginative punishments, including hanging by thumbs.

A total of 12 409 men were confined to Rock Island prison during its 20 month existence. Of these, 730 were transferred to other stations, 3876 were exchanged, 41 successfully escaped, 5581 were paroled home, and some 4000 enlisted in Federal units slated for Western duty, and 1960 died in captivity. (Hesseltine, 1972, p58)

By far the most horrendous Northern camp was Elmira, located in New York a few miles from the Pennsylvania line. Some 9000 prisoners were confined to a camp meant to hold only 5000.

Two observation towers were erected right outside the prison walls. For 15 cents, spectators could watch the wretched prisoners within the compound. When winter struck Elmira in late 1864, prisoners lacking blankets and clad in rags collapsed in droves from exposure. By early December, half-naked men stood ankle-deep in snow to answer the morning roll call.

A one-acre lagoon of stagnant water within the 30-acre stockade served as a latrine and garbage dump, giving rise to disease. Scurvy and diarrhea took many lives. By November 1864, pneumonia had reached plague proportions. An epidemic of smallpox broke out a month later and remained an ever-present killer.

Repeated requests for badly needed medicines were ignored by officials in Washington. The pathetically equipped hospital lacked beds, equipment and personnel. By late December 1864, at least 70 men were lying on bare hospital floors and another 200 diseased and dying men lay in the regular prison quarters, contaminating their healthier comrades.

Non-cooperative prisoners were punished in a variety of ways. Some were confined to the "sweat box" in which the occupant stood immobile and received no ventilation, food or water for the duration of the punishment period. Other men were gagged or hung by their thumbs. Because no prisoner received his regular rations while serving a sentence, punishment meant virtual starvation.

One prison commander would often visit the camp at midnight in freezing weather to have the men called out for "roll call."

In February 1865, the camp held 8996 prisoners, of whom 1398 were sick and 426 died. In March an average of 16 prisoners were dying each day. Of a total of 12 123 soldiers imprisoned at Elmira during its one year existence, 2963 died, or about 25 percent. The monthly death rate, however, topped the one at Andersonville. (Hesseltine, 1972, p96)

In addition to camps for captured soldiers, the North also established concentration camps for civilian populations considered hostile to the Federal government. Union General Thomas Ewing issued his infamous Order Number 11 in August 1863, whereby large numbers of civilians in Missouri were relocated into what were called "posts."

In *Plain Speaking*, "an Oral Biography of Harry S. Truman," the former President tells what happened:

> Everybody, almost the entire population of Jackson County and Vernon and Cass and Bates counties, all of them were depopulated, and the people had to stay in posts.
>
> They called them posts, but what they were, they were concentration camps. And most of the people were moved in such a hurry that they had to leave all their goods and their chattels in their houses. Then the Federal soldiers came in and took everything that was left and set fire to the houses.
>
> That didn't go down very well with the people in these parts; putting people in concentration camps in particular didn't. (pp78-79)

President Truman's grandmother loaded what belongings she could into an oxcart and, with six of her children, among them the President's mother, made the journey to a "post" in Kansas City. Martha Ellen Truman vividly remembered that trek until she died at the age of 94.

Perhaps the most relevant aspect of this whole chapter

for our generation is not the existence of the camps or even the wretched conditions there, but rather the enormous prison propganda campaign complete with charges that the camps *were really killing centers designed to exterminate the inmates.* That war psychosis campaign during and following the Civil War is strikingly reminiscent of the one which grew out of the Second World War.

Journalists, preachers and politicians on both sides portrayed the enemy as fiends who relished in diabolical atrocities. Imaginative prisoners had neither the will nor the ability to make objective judgments about what was going on around them. They often greatly exaggerated conditions and claimed that their suffering was part of a monstrous conspiracy.

As the war progressed, the prisons of the South became crowded and Confederate poverty and organizational disruption resulted in excessive suffering. Reports about these conditions in the North encouraged the belief that the suffering was part of a deliberate design.

The worst cases of the sick prisoners from Belle Isle who were still able to travel were sent North. The ghastly and emaciated condition of these survivors confirmed the already widespread impression that all prisoners held by the South were being slowly killed off.

Northern polemicists declared that the Union had been too cool to these barbarities and demands for retaliation grew.

In anticipation of retaliatory measures, a Northern General ordered "special treatment similar to that which the rebels extend to Union prisoners in Richmond prisons" for a captured Confederate General. (Hesseltine, 1964, p186). This Civil War rendition of *Sonderbehandlung* never achieved the sinister notoriety of its Second World War counterpart.

"Retaliation," stated the *New York Times*, "is a terrible thing, but the miseries and pains and the slowly wasting life of our brethren and friends in thoses horrible prisons is a worse thing." (Hesseltine, 1964, p194). The result of the campaign was that prisoners in Northern prisons were forced to suffer needlessly in retaliation for alleged Southern cruelty.

Lieutenant Colonel William H. Hoffman, the Federal Com-

missary General of Prisons, ordered a preliminary 20 percent reduction of rations in the Union camps. He then ordered increased guard forces in preparation for further ration cuts. Secretary of War Edwin M. Stanton approved another order by Hoffman to further sharply reduce food, fuel, shelter and clothing of prisoners to levels which Union propagandists claimed were equal to those prevailing in the South. Much of the death and suffering in the Northern prisons was a direct result of this action.

Only a sharply increased guard force was able to contain the serious danger of rioting at Camp Morton when the new rations went into effect.

Inspired by the stated policy of retaliation, some camp commanders vindictively took it upon themselves to impose even more suffering on the prisoners in their control.

Congress gave official sanction to the propaganda campaign. The House Committee on the Conduct of the War investigated the condition of prisoners in the Confederate camps. Secretary of War Stanton told the Committee that "the enormity of the crime committed by the rebels toward our prisoners is not known or realized by our people, and cannot but fill with horror the civilized world when the facts are fully revealed. There appears to have been a deliberate system of savage and barbarous treatment the result of which will be that few, if any, of the prisoners that have been in their hands during the past winter will ever again be in a condition to render any service or even to enjoy life." (Hesseltine, 1964, p196)

The House Committee published *Report* No. 67, which included eight pictures of naked or partly naked prisoners released from Belle Isle in the worst state of emaciation and utter despondency. The official report declared that the evidence proved a fixed determination by the Confederates to kill the Union soldiers who fell into their hands.

Several months later, the United States Sanitary Commission (a forerunner of the American Red Cross) published its own *Narrative of the Privations and Sufferings of the United States Officers and Soldiers while Prisoners of War in the Hands of the Rebel Authorities*. Complete with colored pictures of sick released prisoners, the *Narrative* contained all of the atrocity tales told up to that time, and then some. It falsely contended that prisoners were stripped of

their clothing and robbed of their money upon capture, and that naked bodies were heaped into piles awaiting burial to be eaten by hogs, dogs and rats. Not surprisingly, the official *Narrative* concluded that the suffering and death was the result of "a predetermined plan, originating somewhere in the rebel counsels, for destroying and disabling the soldiers of their enemy, who had honorably surrendered in the field." (Hesseltine, 1964, p199). By contrast, conditions for prisoners in the Union camps were described in glowing terms of comfort and abundance.

The Union hailed the account as a truthful portrayal of conditions. *Harper's Weekly* predicted that it would help the Federal cause not only at home but in Europe as well.

Both of these official reports gave an aura of authenticity to the wild propaganda campaign that was sweeping the North. They helped legitimize Federal measures which resulted in preventable suffering and death in the Northern camps. And they helped to justify the harsh and vengeful occupation policy of "reconstruction" imposed by the North at the end of the war.

Federal newspapers blamed the social-political system of the Confederacy for the horrors of the Southern camps. Reports of wretched conditions in the camps confirmed the view that the Confederate system was incurably evil and had to be unconditionally destroyed.

"We've not heard as much lately as formerly of the maltreatment of prisoners in Richmond," wrote the *New York Times*, "but it has not abated. Nay, their diabolism will never abate as long as it is in their power to exercise it. The slaveholder is born to tyranny and reared to cruelty." (Hesseltine, 1964, p195). Another paper declared that "only slavery could so harden a man," ignoring the fact that owning slaves was still legal in some Union states, and that Washington and Jefferson had been slaveholders!

The *New York Times* went a step further to malign even the personal character of the Southerner: "The Southern character is infinitely boastful, vainglorious, full of dash, without endurance, treacherous, cunning, timid, and revengeful."

The propaganda campaign did not die at all with the end of the war. In fact, accounts of conditions in the southern prison camps became even more exaggerated. In 1869, the

House of Representatives issued another official publication on the *Treatment of Prisoners of War by the Rebel Authorities*. This *House Report* No. 85 amplified the distortions contained in the 1864 *House Report* and the Sanitary Commission *Narrative*.

The new *Report* stated:

> The opinion of the committee carefully and deliberately formed (is) that the neglect and refusal of the rebel authorities to provide sufficient and proper rations was the result of a premeditated system and scheme of the confederate authorities to reduce our ranks by starvation, and that they were not forced to these deprivations from accident or necessity. (Rhodes, pp503-04)

Former prisoners kept on turning out personalized and rabidly polemical accounts of camp conditions which found ready readerships. Many of those who published "personal memoirs" of their experiences rewrote copiously from the official Federal government "documentary" reports. But many dubious readers were impressed by the volume of camp literature. The years 1862-66 saw 54 books and articles published describing the experiences of prisoners in the South. Of these, 28 appeared in the years 1865 and 1866. Twenty more appeared in 1867-70. (Hesseltine, 1964, pp247, 252)

The author of *Prisoner of War*, a typical example of the genre, wrote: "I send out this book trusting that whatever influence it may exercise will aid in bringing the guilty leaders of Treason to just punishment for their enormous crimes against humanity."

The polemical post-war writers faced something of a problem with figures in trying to prove that the South had killed off prisoners as part of a deliberate extermination policy. The number of Union prisoners who died was not large enought to substantiate the claim. So the myth-makers either ignored the numbers completely, or came up with new figures of their own. One writer claimed, for example, that no record remains of the many prisoners who "were pursued through fen and forest by bloodhounds and demons and their mangled corpses left to the carrion birds."

Republican party politicians waved the "bloody shirt" of

Southern atrocity stories to keep themselves in power. But the most regrettable effect of the post-war propaganda campaign was to exacerbate the horrors of Reconstruction in the occupied South.

The high point in the atrocity campaign came with the farcical show trial and execution of Henry Wirz, the commandant of Andersonville. Next to the assassination of President Lincoln, the Andersonville story was the most effective propaganda weapon in the arsenal of those who wanted to deal harshly with the defeated South.

During the war, the Northern press described Wirz as a "monster" and a "beast" and portrayed him as a vicious sadist. He was nothing of the kind, but because he spoke with a foreign accent and was the officer with whom the prisoners had the most contact, he bore the brunt of blame for conditions in the camp.

Henry Wirz was born in Zurich, Switzerland, and emigrated to the United States in 1849. He worked as a weaver in Massachusetts and as a doctor's assistant in Kentucky before moving to a plantation in Louisiana. He joined the Confederate army when war broke out and was severely wounded at the Battle of Seven Pines. After recovering he was promoted to Captain and assigned as commandant of Andersonville in March 1864.

Wild rumors about Wirz made their way within the stockade. What one prisoner suspected was told to the next as fact. In the imagaination of the inmates, Wirz became the cruel and inhuman author of all their sufferings.

After his arrest, Wirz was taken to Washington where a military commission charged him with "conspiring" with Confederate President Davis, General Robert E. Lee and others to "impair and injure the health and destroy the lives of large numbers of Federal prisoners." All of this was allegedly done "in furtherance of his evil design." The commission further charged Wirz with several specific acts of murder "in violation of the laws and customs of war."

While Wirz was sometimes gruff and ill-natured, the prosector could not prove that he ever murdered a single prisoner. Neither the judge-advocate who drew up the thirteen specifications nor any of the witnesses called by the government were able to name any of the alleged victims. To substantiate the conspiracy charge, the prosecu-

tion cited an order by Confederate General Winder which instructed an artillery battery to open fire upon the Andersonville camp. The order was a forgery. Other "documents" cited to prove a conspiracy were equally baseless.

The Northern press couldn't find words strident enough to characterize the defendant: "the Andersonville savage," "the inhuman wretch," "the infamous captain," "the barbarian," "the most bloodthirsty monster which this or any other age has produced."

Actually, Wirz was merely an unfortunate victim of circumstance—a target of unrestrained hysteria. Confederate officers sent to inspect the camp during the war were unanimous in their praise of Wirz's energy and diligence. His commanding General praised his performance. An inspector from Richmond declared that he was firm and rigid in discipline but kind to the prisoners. Wirz tried repeatedly to provide adequate shelter, food and medical supplies, but governmental red tape, local opposition, and the rapidly deteriorating economy of the beleagured South frustrated his efforts.

Held in the vengeful climate that followed the Lincoln assasination, the trial was used to boost the post-war campaign to new heights of hysteria. The *New York Times* commented on the Wirz case in vindictive and emotional prose that could almost have been written in the late 1940s:

> The assassins of the president disposed of, the Government will next take in hand the ruffians who tortured to death thousands of Union prisoners. The laws of civilized warfare must be vindicated; and some expiation must be exacted for the most infernal crime of the century. In respect to Captain Werz (*sic*), for instance it may be shown that he went into his business of wholesale murder on express instructions by superior authority. It is manifest that this maltreatment must have proceeded from some general design upon the part of the rebel Government. The persons detailed for the charge of the military prisons in the "Confederacy" were men whose natural disposition especially qualified them for a brutal and base business.

The influential paper demanded full punishment for "every rebel official who has been concerned, directly or indirectly, in the torturing and murdering of our prisoners.

Of all rebel crimes, that was the most devilish, the least capable of extenuation or pardon." (Hesseltine, 1964, pp237-38)

A Federal official sent to Andersonville recommended that the camp be taken over by the government and maintained as a permanent reminder of Confederate horror. (Shades of Dachau!) The *New York Times* agreed: "The thing most needed since the prostration of the rebellion is to make it (Andersonville) odious and famous." Another leading Union paper stated that the South must be made to "face" the horrors of Andersonville. It advised the Federal government to publish the most self-incriminating documents in the Confederate archives and declared the that "loyal men should strive to keep alive the infamy of the rebellion." (Hesseltine, 1964, p239). For added justification and propaganda effect, the Federal government issued a lengthy publication, *The Trial of Henry Wirz*, which gave a veneer of legitimacy to the trial and execution.

The commissioners were grossly unfair in their conduct of the trial. Wirz' defense attorneys despaired of fair treatment for their client and quit in frustration. They returned to represent Wirz only after the friendless defendant begged their help in utter despair. Despite the pathetic lack of evidence, the commisson found Wirz guilty and sentenced him to death. He was hanged in Washington on 10 November 1865.

In the wake of the publicity surrounding the trial, former prisoners founded the "Andersonville Survivors Association" and the "National Ex-Prisoners of War Association" to lobby Congress for disability pension legislation. The "Survivors" claimed that the mere fact of having spent the summer of 1864 at Andersonville should be adequate evidence of permanent disability.

Many aspects of the Wirz trial are strikingly similar to the "war crimes" trials following the Second World War. Both followed intense propaganda campaigns to which the government contributed authoritative but spurious "documentation." Both were concerned only with the "crimes" of the defeated power. Both were used to indict the social-political system of the losing side. Both called upon self-serving witnesses who had motives of their own for testifying. Both trials alleged an elaborate "conspiracy" of mur-

derous intent. Both used phoney "documents" to substantiate their case.

It took several decades before intense vindictiveness gave way to a modicum of reconciliation. Truth-seeking historical accounts slowly replaced the bitterly partisan diatribes. Revisionist historians eventually discredited the many phoney "documents," "memoirs," and "true accounts" about the Civil War prison camps.

There is, of course, no doubt that prisoners on both sides suffered and died, often under regrettable conditions. But neither side deliberately killed prisoners. Prisoners on both sides were always well treated at the front. It was behind the lines where bad management, especially in the South, resulted in so much death and suffering.

The same factors which contributed to military defeat also made it virtually impossible for the Confederacy to operate an efficient prisoner-of-war system. Southern industrial output was inadequate for logistical support of the armed forces, with the result that prison camps were extremely primitive in construction and maintainence. For various reasons, the military leadership was never able to properly clothe and feed Confederate soldiers, much less enemy prisoners of war. And finally, the Southern rail and water transportation system was so crippled during the final two years of the war that movement of supplies, especically to peripheral points like Andersonville, frequently became impossible.

Exact figures on the number of prisoners held on both sides and a precise comparison of the mortality rates on each side are impossible to obtain. After the war, Confederate and Federal partisans each cited statistics to prove that the death and suffering had been greater in the enemy camps. Former Confederate President Davis and former Vice President Alexander Stephens cited rather dubious figures to support their claim that the mortality rate in the Northern prisons was twelve percent, as compared to less than nine percent for the South.

The best and most reliable estimate available seems to be the one provided by Adjutant General F.C. Ainsworth in 1903 to the eminent historian James F. Rhodes. The Chief of the Record and Pension Office stated that the best information obtainable from both Union and Confederate records

showed that the North held 214 865 Southern soldiers, of whom 25 976 died in captivity, while the South held 193 743 Union men, of whom 30 218 died in captivity. Rhodes concluded that slightly over 12 percent of the prisoners held by the Union perished, while 15.5 percent died in Southern camps. But Rhodes felt that given the superior hospitals medicines, and abudance of food, mortality in the Northern prisons should have been lower.

"All things considered," Rhodes concluded, "the statistics show no reason why the North should reproach the South. If we add to one side of the account the refusal to exchange the prisoners and the greater resources, and to the other the distress of the Confederacy, the balance struck will not be far from even. Certain it is that no deliberate intention existed either in Richmond or Washington to inflict suffering on captives more than inevitably accompanied their confinement." (Rhodes, p508)

In the Civil War, as in the Second World War, the victorious side hysterically distorted the actual conditions in the camps of the enemy to brand the defeated adversary as intrinsically evil and to justify a harsh and vindictive occupation policy. All the suffering and death in the camps of the side that lost the war was ascribed to a deliberate policy on the part of an inherently atrocious power. The victorious powers demanded "unconditional surrender" and arrested the defeated government leaders as "criminals."

After both wars, Revisionist historians who worked to set the record straight were denounced for trying to "rehabilitate" a discredited and abominable social order. The social-political system of the side that lost each war was deemed not merely different, but morally depraved. The defeated side was judged ethically in terms of its readiness to atone for past sins and embrace the social system of the conquerers.

Bibliography

Baker, Raymond F., *Andersonville: The story of a Civil War prison camp*, Washington, DC, 1972.

Futch, Ovid L., *History of Andersonville Prison*, University of Florida Press, 1968.

Hesseltine, William B., *Civil War Prisons: A Study in War Psychology*, New York, 1964.

Hesseltine, William B., ed., *Civil War Prisons*, Kent State University Press, 1972.

Miller, Merle, *Plain Speaking* (An Oral Biography of Harry S. Truman), New York, 1974.

Rhodes, James F., *History of the United States*, (Vol. V. 1864-1865, Ch. XXIX), 1904, and Port Washington, NY, 1967.

Allied War Crimes Trials

ANDREAS R. WESSERLE

On 14 November 1945, the proceedings of the International Military Tribunal at Nürnberg (Nuremberg) were opened. The twenty-four accused, whose number was later reduced to twenty-two by disease and death, among the top officials of the National Socialist Party, the top leadership of the armed forces and of the state administration of the defeated German state, were confronted with three classes of accusations:

1. Crimes against peace;
2. War crimes in a more restricted sense, e.g., violations of the laws and customs of war;
3. Crimes against humanity.

Nine months later, twelve of the defendants were indeed condemned to death on the basis of two or more of the charges, three were set free, and the remainder was sentenced to prison terms of varying duration. [1]

Controversy was aroused among jurists and the general public alike, above all in regard to the validity and treatment of points (1) and (3).

On 3 May 1946, the proceedings of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East were opened at Tokyo. The twenty-eight accused, whose number was later reduced to twenty-five by death and insanity, among the top officials of the administration and the armed forces of the state of Japan, were confronted with the charges of having committed crimes against peace and war crimes (violations of the laws and customs of war); there were no accusations of crimes against humanity. One year and a half later, seven of them were indeed hanged, and sixteen sentenced to lifetime imprisonment on fifty-five counts. [2]

The prehistory of the Tokyo Trials was somewhat different from those at Nürnberg. The principles and methods for the

latter were laid down, at first provisionally, at a meeting between representatives of Britain, the U.S.A. and the USSR in October 1943 at Moscow and with greater clarity during a conference in June 1945, between delegates of the three first-named states and those of France. In Moscow, two kinds of classifications were established: (1) those officers and men who had committed, or carried out, atrocities in a particular country would be sent back to that country to be tried; (2) in the case of major war criminals whose offense had no particular geographic location, they would be ". . . punished by the joint decisions of the Governments of the Allies." [3] The purpose of the London meeting in 1945 was to provide a systematic procedure and a code of law for the subsequent Nürnberg process. [4] The accomplishments of the London conference, and some of the problems arising from it, will be treated in greater detail below.

The International Military Tribunal in Tokyo, on the other hand, was first contemplated at the Cairo Conference of 1 December 1943. Further references concerning the trial of alleged Japanese war criminals were made in the Declaration of Potsdam of 26 July 1945, and in the Instrument of Surrender of 2 September 1945. On 19 January 1946, General McArthur, as Supreme Commander of the Allied forces in the Far East, established the Tribunal for the trial of offenses similar to those charged against the accused at Nürnberg, with the exception of "crimes against humanity." [5]

In addition to these major legal processes, "war crimes trials" were also conducted against individual enemy officials and commanders, and against subordinate organizations, both in the Orient and in Europe, by individual victor powers. The proceedings against General Yamashita, the trials in the four zones of Germany conducted according to Law Number 10 of the Allied Control Council, and the twelve "lower" Nürnberg trials of 1947 and 1948, are commonly included in discussions of the war crimes trials. [6]

For the epoch-making International Military Tribunal at Nürnberg, which lasted for nine months, members of the Tribunal were selected from among the four large victor nations: Britain, France, the U.S.A., and the USSR. On the side of the prosecution, the Main Prosecutor for the U.S. was

Justice Robert H. Jackson (who was also Chief of Counsel); for Britain, State Attorney General Sir Hartley Shawcross; for France, Francois de Menthon, Auguste Champetier de Ribes; for the USSR, General R.A. Rudenko.[7] On the side of the Tribunal sat Mr. Francis Biddle, member for the U.S., and his alternate, Judge John J. Parker; M. le Professeur Donnedieu de Vabres, member for France, and his alternate, M. le Conseiller Falco; Major-General I.T. Nikitchenko, member for the USSR, and his alternate, Lieutenant-Colonel L.T. Volchkov; and, finally, Sir Geoffrey Lawrence (now Lord Oaksey), member for the United Kingdom, and his alternate, Sir William Norman Birkett (now Lord Justice). Sir Geoffrey was elected Chairman of this panel of jurists. [8]

The mechanical aspect of the proceedings was impressive by itself. The trial was conducted in four languages, involved the calling of thirty-three witnesses in open court for the Prosecution, sixty-one for the Defense, a further 143 for the Defense via written answers, and some thousands of others giving evidence by affidavit for Defense and Prosecution. [9]

The judgment of the Court was delivered on 30 September and 1 October 1946. Of the twenty-one defendants personally present (Martin Bormann was unavoidably detained) three were acquitted: Franz von Papen, Chancellor of the Weimar Republic in 1933, before the takeover of Hitler, Ambassador to Turkey afterwards, and imprisoned by Hitler in the closing months of the war as untrustworthy; [10] Hans Fritsche, National Socialist radio propagandist; and Hjalmar Schacht, erstwhile Director of the German *Reichs-Bank*, internationally esteemed financial expert, and, together with Papen, supporter of the "strongman" Hitler in the waning days of the Weimar Republic, similarly subject to change of mind, and similarly imprisoned.[11] Three defendants received life sentences: Rudolf Hess, once Second-in-Command to Hitler and best known for his "peace flight" to Britain (1941); Walter Funk, National Socialist economic organizer and Erich Raeder, Grand Admiral of the former German Fleet and advocate of a stronger surface fleet before 1939, cautioning against military involvement with Britain. [12] Four received jail sentences of ten to twenty years: Baldur von Schirach, National Socialist youth leader; Albert

Speer, expert Organizer of armaments production (although once an architect by trade); Constantin von Neurath, Foreign Minister before 1938 and *Reichsprotektor* of Bohemia-Moravia prior to 1942; and Karl Doenitz, capable submarine admiral and head of the German *Reich* in its last days in 1945. [13] The remaining twelve accused were condemned to death, among them the top leaders of the National Socialist party-and-state machine: Hermann Wilhelm Goering, Joachim von Ribbentrop, Wilhelm Keitel, Ernst Kaltenbrunner, Hans Frank, Wilhelm Frick, Alfred Rosenberg, Julius Streicher, Fritz Sauckel, Alfred Jodl, Arthur Seyss-Inquart and Martin Bormann. In addition, the following groups and organizations were declared criminal: the SS and SD (*Schutzstaffel, Sicherheitsdienst*–Himmler's private army and security police); the SA (*Sturmabteilung*–the storm-troopers powerful during the dusk of the Weimar Republic, under their leader Roehm, who was liquidated by Hitler in 1934); the *Gestapo* (*Geheime Staatspolizei*–the secret police under the wing of the SS and Himmler); and the Leadership Corps of the National Socialist Party. The *Reich* Cabinet and the General Staff and High Command of the German Armed Forces (OKH and OKW –*Oberkommando des Heeres, Oberkommando der Wehrmacht*) were, as corporate entities, acquitted of the charge of criminality. [14]

Treading in the footsteps of the International Military Tribunal at Nürnberg with regard to the three points of accusation, and especially in harmony with the principle of personal responsibility for "criminal" orders established there, the war crimes trials which were held against German leaders of subordinate level were conducted by so-called victor powers in many European countries, including the four individual occupying powers acting within their segments of Germany.

Aside from the obviously biased and political proceedings in Communist-occupied Europe, [15] two of the Western powers acted on the strength of the Allied Control Council Law Number 10 (mentioned above) which authorized the four Zone Commanders to set up tribunals for the punishment of war crimes, crimes against peace and crimes against humanity. The British occupation authorities, the Government of

which had shown mixed feelings about the extent of the categories of offenses punishable under the Nürnberg Charter, did not follow Law Number 10, but heeded the Royal Warrant of 14 June 1945, which instituted prosecution of "violations of the laws and usages of war" only. In addition to the trials held by occupation authorities, a number of persons were also charged before German courts with crimes committed against German nationals or stateless persons. [16] Furthermore, the Allies, among them especially the U.S., created special Denazification Courts—which were later handed over to the Germans—to carry out the task of "cleansing" the mass of small-time fellow-travellers. In the American Zone, 3.6 million out of 16 million adults were thus processed and filed in an elaborate classification and penalty scheme. [17]

In the British Zone, military tribunals tried 937 persons, acquitted 260, and sentenced 230 to death. In the U.S. Zone, 177 persons were tried by military tribunals, 24 were sentenced to death, 35 acquitted. In the small French Zone, military courts tried 2,107 people, condemned 104 to death, acquitted 404, and gave 1,235 shorter prison terms. [18]

In Western Europe, military trials were also conducted by the Netherlands (35), Norway (11), Canada (5), and Greece (1). Additionally, the three big Western powers tried German defendants in countries where the latter had held official positions. Thus, Generals von Mackensen, Maelzer and Kesselring were tried in Rome and Venice, respectively, by British authorities, while General Dostler was subjected to a similar process by the United States in Rome. [19] In addition, twelve subsequent Nürnberg trials were carried out from January 1947 to October 1948. In these, a motley and highly divergent collection of defendants was tried; many sentenced to death or to long prison terms. These "lower" Nürnberg proceedings were conducted by the United States Government against the following groups: (1) the Concentration Camp Medical Case, (2) the Milch Case against Air Field Marshal Milch, a deputy of Goering, (3) the Justice Case against a number of high-ranking judges of the Third *Reich*, (4) the SS Case against some surviving leaders of the SS, (5) the Flick Case against this steel magnate and five associated

industrialists, (6) the Farben Case against twenty-four officials of the *Interessen-Gemeinschaft Farben* chemical trust, (7) the Hostages Case against army officers charged with violating the customs of war; let it be briefly noted here that some of these twelve generals, among them Speidel, Lanz, and Foertsch, had actively conspired against Hitler and vainly tried to get in touch with Allied leaders since 1942/43 [20], (8) the RUSHA Case against National Socialist "Race Administrators," (9) the *Einsatzgruppen* Case against leaders of anti-partisan commandoes, (10) the Krupp Case against this industrial leader and eleven of his collaborators, (11) the Ministries Case against chief administrators in the war economy and the foreign office, (12) the High Command Case against fourteen high-ranking generals of the Army and Air Force.[21]

The main trial of alleged Japanese war criminals, corresponding in scope to the Nürnberg case for the European theater, was the International Military Tribunal for the Far East, convened in Tokyo on 3 May 1946, and concluded on 11 November 1948, or some two years later than its European counterpart. Eleven states furnished judges and prosecutors: Britain, China, France, the U.S.A., the USSR, Canada, Australia, India, New Zeland, the Netherlands and the Philippines. In distinction to the Nürnberg trials, where all defense counsels were Germans, a mixed team of both Japanese and American attorneys managed the defense. Also in distinction to the Nürnberg proceedings, the defendants were accused of but two classes of offenses, crimes against peace and war crimes. There were no charges of membership in criminal organizations and of crimes against humanity, except where they bore directly upon war crimes. Out of the twenty-five surviving defendants, one received a prison term of seven years (Ambassador Shigemitsu), one a term of twenty years (Ambassador and Imperial Foreign Minister Togo); sixteen were sentenced to life imprisonment, and seven were condemned to die. [22] The accused given life sentences were: Araki, Imperial War Minister; Hashimoto; Hata; Hiranuma, Prime Minister; Hoshino, President of the Economic Planning Board; Kaya, former Finance Minister; Kido; Education Minister; Koiso, Prime Minister; Minami,

War Minister; Oka; Oshima, Ambassador; Sato; Shimada, Navy Minister; Shiratori, Ambassador; Suzuki, President of the Economic Planning Board (a post also held by Hoshino); Umezu, Minister Without Portfolio. The seven who were hanged were: Dohihara; Hirota, Prime Minister; Itagaki, War Minister; Kimura; Matsui; Muto; and Hideki Tojo, Chief of the Army General Staff and Prime Minister. [23]

Aside from the military trials held by Australia (numbering 275) and China (numbering two), Britain and the United States conducted further proceedings. Thus, the U.S. heard 317 cases in Japan, 11 in China, 97 in the Philippines, 25 in the Pacific Islands, for a total of 3,095 defendants tried, 448 acquitted, 689 condemned to death. [24] Perhaps the most famous of these cases (or, most infamous, according to one's interpretation of justice) was the trial of the able General Yamashita, conqueror of Malaya and Singapore against an enemy vastly superior in numbers, and later, commander of the Japanese Army in the Philippines. Sentenced to death, his case was appealed to the ultimate pinnacle of the U.S. Supreme Court which upheld the conviction.[25]

The Japanese "democratization" counterpart to the German Denazification was also numerically impressive, involving the examination of millions of questionnaires; it seems to have been more efficient, as "only" some 200,000 persons of formerly higher status were purged from public life.[26] SCAP, Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, however, had other deep-going reforms in store for the Japanese, including the renunciation of divinity by the Emperor (the revering of whom was enshrined in the official state religion, *Shinto*), and the democratization of the Meiji Constitution of 1889 in harmony with the principles of the Potsdam Declaration. Wisely, SCAP, General McArthur and his advisors retained the office of Constitutional Emperor, making him the titular ". . . symbol of the State and of the unity of the People . . ."[27] Again, the scope of this paper prohibits further unravelling of this fascinating theme.

In sum, one may safely say that millions of people in the occupied countries of Europe and the Far East were directly or indirectly affected by the war crimes trials conducted by the Western Allies. In conjunction with the lost war, the

numerous and multilayered judicial proceedings against members of the former Axis Governments—and, by extension, against the peoples ruled by them—radically uprooted social and political patterns which, in certain instances, had stood the test of centuries, or of millenia. Purists may argue that the suffering of the defeated (as well as of some of the victors) was brought on by the aggressive and brutal conduct of their leaders, and that the victors only strove to re-impose order and justice on "the world." One may ask that, if all was well with the world before the so-defined aggressions started, why did they start at all; and, if all was not well, why did the wise victors-to-be not change it for the better, or, failing in this, refrain from bandying about "idealistic" statements purporting to show that they could? In other words, the preconditions and the conduct of the war crimes trials were not based on traditional legal foundations, but were tainted with uncertainty and "politics." The rest of this paper will be occupied with tracing the rationalizations of the Allied judges and with laying bare a few crucial weak points in the *plaidoyers* of the Allied persecution. Viewed positively, the content of the paper will center about the struggle carried on against legal uncertainty and the exigencies of a war-ridden world by those Allied jurists who desired to arrive at new, more comprehensive, and less challengeable, principles of international law—a struggle against themselves, so to speak. We shall try to examine the actions of the Western powers at the trials by the guiding light of these questions: (1) how did they justify their police and judicial proceedings? (2) did their procedures accord with their professed substantive principles, and could these principles claim to be extensions of existing international usage and law? (3) possibly, could the failures alleged of the trials be said to spring from failures and contradictions in the *Grundnormen* (to paraphrase Hans Kelsen) of Western Civilization, of the Western Powers, or of their principal leaders? The questions have been raised, but they cannot with finality be laid to rest within the confines of this paper.

With emphasis on the actions of the International Military Tribunal at Nürnberg, such orientation will necessitate locating the foundations of the war trials, outlining a his-

tory of attempts at humanizing warfare, including the drawing of inferences from the development of international relations between the wars, and touching on the main criticism of the trials. These, showing errors of omission and commission, as it were, of the Western Allies, will be treated in separate sections—errors worthy of high rank on any perennial list of war crimes—yes, deeds unpunished, unmitigated, but glorified, as having contributed to the annals of civilization and "progress."[28] (to be continued)

Footnotes

1. Viscount Maugham, *UNO and War Crimes*, with a postscript by Lord Hankey, London, John Murray, 1951, p17.
2. John Alan Appleman, of the Illinois Bar, *Military Tribunals and International Crimes*, Indianapolis, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Publishers, 1954, pp237-238.
3. Maugham, *op. cit.*, p25.
4. Charles G. Fenwick, *Cases on International Law*, Chicago, Callaghan and Company, Second Edition 1951, p839.
5. *Ibid.*, pp839-855.
   Appleman, *op. cit.*, pp238-243.
6. *Ibid.*, pp139-235.
   Fenwick, *op. cit.*, p839.
   Georg Schwarzenberger, *The Frontiers of International Law*, London, Stearns and Sons, Limited, 1962, pp256-273.
   A. Frank Reel, *The Case of General Yamashita*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1949, pp176-184, 241-250.
7. *Das Urteil von Nürnberg 1955*. Munich, Deutscher Taschenbuchverlag, 1962, p10.
8. Maugham, *op. cit.*, p50.
9. *Ibid.*, p51.
   Das Urteil, op. cit., pp9-11.
10. Hans Erich Stier, *Deutsche Geschichte*, Berlin-Darmstadt-Wien, Deutsche Buchgemeinschaft, 1958, pp951-953.
11. *Ibid.*, p968.
12. Michael Freund, *Der zweite Weltkreig*, Gutersloh, C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1962, pp15, 54.
13. Stier, *op. cit.*, pp. 968, 973.
14. Appleman, *op. cit.*, pp6-7, 40-45.

15. Wolfgang Leonhard, *Die Revolution entlasst ihre Kinder.* Koln-Berlin, Kiepenheuer und Witsch, 1956, pp310-322.
Also: Margarete Buber-Neumann, *Als Gefangene bei Stalin und Hitler*, Munich, Deutscher Taschenbuchverlag, 1962.
Silvieu Craciunas, *The Lost Footsteps*, New York, Berkeley Publishing Corporation, 1963.
16. Maugham, *op. cit.*, pp21-24.
17. Arnold J. Heidenheimer, *The Governments of Germany*, New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1961, fourth printing 1964, pp53-54.
18. Maugham, *op. cit.*, p23.
19. Appleman, *op. cit.*, pp269-289.
20. "The Minister in Sweden (Johnson) to the Secretary of State," Stockholm, 3 January 1944.
"Memorandum by Brigadier General John Magruder, Deputy Director of Intelligence Service, to Mr. Fletcher Warren, Executive Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State (Berle)," 17 May 1944.
"Text of a Telegram Dated December 25th, Sent by Mr. Eden to His Majesty's Ambassadors at Moscow and Washington."
All of these reprinted documents are contained in: *Foreign Relations of the United States Diplomatic Papers 1944.* Washington, the United States Government Printing Office, 1959, pp485-525.
21. Appleman, *op. cit.*, pp139-233.
22. *Ibid.*, p. IX, pp237-238.
23. Theodore McNelly, *The Contemporary Government of Japan*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963, pp33-34.
24. Appleman, *op. cit.*, p267.
25. Reel, *op. cit.*, pp246-250.
John Deane Potter, *The Life and Death of a Japanese General*, New York, Signet Book, 1962, pp41-94, 153-177.
26. McNelly, *op. cit.*, p32.
27. Philip H. Taylor, "The Administration of Occupied Japan"; in: *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Philadelphia, volume 267, January 1950, p146.
Redvers Ogie, *et al*, *The Search for Peace Settlements.* Washington, D.C., The Brookings Institution, 1951, pp280-282.
28. Montgomery Belgion, *Victor's Justice*, Henry Regnery Company, Hinsdale, Illinois, 1949, pp42-187.

The Malmédy Massacre and Trial

RAY MERRIAM

In 1977, I received a newspaper clipping from a reader of my own publication, *The Military Journal*. The clipping contained an interview with Paul Martin, a survivor of the so-called "Malmédy Massacre," and had apparently been published on the previous anniversary of the incident.

Martin's comments are quite interesting. It is readily apparent that he has no grudge against the men of Peiper's unit for what they did, and he states:

"They were just doing their job. Besides, we did the same later on. I talked to men in the hospital who said we killed unarmed prisoners of war."

However, based on what I had read about the "massacre" previously, some points made by Martin and the interviewer did not seem quite correct. This led to my re-reading just about everything I had on the subject (which, at the time, was limited to other historians' published accounts). I not only discovered some points where the interview did not seem factual, but also that the other accounts could not agree on certain important points. Thus, I added some editorial notes in several places when I published the interview in early 1979.

A number of people wrote in to comment on this interview. Though I did not feel my editorial notes were especially controversial, since they were based entirely on fairly standard works, I did expect to receive some mail from irate readers.

However, out of over a dozen letters and brief comments made by readers concerning the Martin interview, only three, surprisingly, questioned my editorial comments. Two were strictly emotional outbursts. The third, however, was considerably less emotional and attempted to refute my comments by utilizing two sources I had not consulted.

The publication of that letter, and rebuttals to it by Mr. Landwehr and myself, produced additional responses, largely favorable to our point of view. The publication of the Martin interview and the subsequent debate in the letters column of my journal, led to Mr. Brandon of the Institute for Historical Review inviting me to this convention to speak on the subject of the "massacre," the trial and its aftermath.

However, in the short time I had available (about four months), I was unable to acquire all the material that one should really examine in order to discuss this subject sufficiently. Certain items, of prime importance to any serious research of the "massacre," have been difficult to locate. Perhaps the most important of these, the published record of the Malmédy Massacre investigation conducted by a Subcomittee of the Comittee on Armed Services of the U.S. Senate, had been most elusive for me. Numerous unsuccessful attempts to acquire this book through my local library led me to various used book dealers in an attempt to purchase a copy. Finally, just one week ago, a book dealer located a copy which I have purchased; naturally, a few days later the library informed me they had the same material! Unfortunately, acquiring this work only a few days before the convention would not allow me time to even fully read its over 1600 pages, let alone use it in the preparation of this paper.

Some material did not arrive until the last moment and there is still a considerable amount of material I am still trying to locate. Thus, I am presenting today only some of the important points concerning the incident, the trial and its aftermath. My research will continue beyond this and I will provide the Institute for Historical Review with articles based on my continuing research. At some appropriate point in the future, after I am satisfied with my research efforts, I will produce a book covering the entire subject.

The unit commanded by 29-year-old Lieutenant Colonel Joachim Peiper consisted basically of his First SS Panzer Regiment, a battalion plus an additional company of panzergrenadiers, two companies of motorized combat engineers, an anti-aircraft company, a few King Tiger tanks of the 501st Heavy Tank Battalion, and a company of *Luftwaffe* paratroopers. Such composite formations were known as *kampfgruppes*, or battle groups, and were formed to per-

form a specific task. The task of *Kampfgruppe* Peiper, as the spearhead of the 1st SS Panzer Division, and, indeed, the 6th Panzer Army, was to reach the Meuse River with all possible speed.

Eventually, the route they actually travelled would take them through Honsfeld, Bullingen, Baugnez, Ligneauville, Stavelot, Trois Ponts, La Gleize, and Stoumont, with elements of his command going to Petit Thier, Wanne, Lutrebois, and Cheneux. In each of these towns, and at times on the roads between them, it is alleged that men from Peiper's command killed various numbers of unarmed American soldiers as they were surrendering, or after they were captured. Additional numbers of dead civilians have been largely attributed to Peiper's men also.

The exact count of the dead, American military and civilian, has never been conclusively established. At the trial, the prosecution declared they would prove the murder of from 538 to 749 prisoners of war and over 90 Belgian civilians (and they suggested that the number was probably even higher.) It appears that the figures finally settled on were 350 American soldiers and 111 civilians.

And of these, it is not certain how many may have actually been justifiably killed: some Americans may not have totally surrendered to their captors; some may have attempted to delay or impede the progress of Peiper's troops, or made outright sabotage attempts; some may not have surrendered all their weapons; others may have been slow to obey commands or even totally disobeyed them. There was the possibility of accidental shootings as well.

Yet, one cannot deny the fact that at least some American prisoners had been killed under highly suspect circumstances, if not murdered outright.

The matter of civilian deaths along Peiper's route of advance is even more clouded. Many were, indeed, killed, but it could not always be clearly established by whom and under what circumstances. In house-to-house fighting it was a common tactic to toss grenades into buildings first and then rush in with weapons firing.

Accidental deaths of civilians caught in battle zones was the rule rather than the exception. One woman, carrying her baby, was killed while running from house to house, trying to escape the battle; it was not determined which

side fired the fatal shots, but it was most certainly accidental.

In one instance, a Belgian killed a wounded German soldier with an ax, and was promptly shot by Peiper's men.

Evidence given at the trial, however, did indicate that some civilians were killed without justification by Peiper's troops.

Claims that Belgian guerrilla fighters were active throughout the area were proven truthful. One defendant told how an officer instructed him to shoot a Belgian, the officer claiming the Belgian was a guerrilla fighter.

The mere thought of the presence of guerrillas, who would be virtually indistinguishable from the rest of the population, would obviously make any soldier trigger-happy around civilians in a combat zone. Some defendants, including Peiper, claimed to have seen civilians firing on German troops.

But in some cases, the claim by the prosecution of the killing of civilians and military personnel by Peiper's troops could not be proven or was effectively disproven.

The prosecution claimed at least nine civilians were murdered by Peiper's men in Bullingen. One of the defense lawyers made a brief investigative trip to Bullingen. He brought back an affidavit from the village mayor and registrar, whose task it was to keep track of the citizenry (and not a very hard task in a small community of about 300), which stated only two citizens had died since 16 December 1944: one of natural causes, in 1946, the other by shrapnel from American artillery fire (the latter claim was supported by an affidavit from the husband of the woman who was killed). Still, it was possible that transient civilians might have been killed in Bullingen by Peiper's men.

The prosecution, on the basis of a number of sworn statements, alleged that as many as 311 American prisoners had been killed in La Gleize. Hal McCown, ultimately the defense's star witness, was a major at the time of the Offensive and spent several days as Peiper's prisoner in La Gleize. He maintained that during that time he had not seen a single dead American prisoner. The prosecution pointed out that McCown had not seen all parts of the village.

The defense was, however, able to offer several affidavits by La Gleize residents who had been present during

the Germans' stay there. None had seen any American prisoners shot, nor the dead bodies from any alleged shootings, nor had they even heard of any such incidents.

These were followed by testimony from German witnesses who supported the observations of McCown and the civilians. But, as in other instances during the trial, the Belgians' testimony in favor of the defendants was highly effective, since they had no stake in the outcome of the case. Indeed, they would tend to be hostile towards the defendants if anything.

The defense was often able to counter the prosecution's allegations, though not always successfully. Part of the problem was in trying to defend 74 men at once. Although all were accused of the same basic crime, each played a different part in it. Separate charges, though not always specific, were brought against each, however, the U.S. Military Government had determined they be tried *en masse* for the sake of "efficiency."

The first review of the trial was performed by Maximilian Koessler, a civilian attorney of the War Crimes Branch of the Judge Advocate General's Department. Koessler believed the mass trial, and especially the use of numbered placards worn around the defendants' necks as a means of identification, made it difficult for the judges to distinguish one prisoner from another. The result was that evidence of guilt against some would tend to be damaging to all.

The defense did request that two separate trials be held: one for those accused of having issued illegal orders, and another for those accused of having carried them out. This request was denied by the court, in the first of many instances where the court would favor the prosecution, even when the defense was clearly in the right.

The bench assembled for the trial consisted of eight men. The presiding officer was Brigadier General Josiah T. Dalbey. The crucial position of law member was filled by Colonel Abraham H. Rosenfeld; it was his duty to interpret applicable law and determine procedure. (Rosenfeld had recently acted for the prosecution in the Mauthausen Concentration Camp case and thus one has to suspect his objectivity in the Malmédy case.) Line officers, all colonels, made up the rest of the bench.

Chief defense counsel was Colonel Willis M. Everett, Jr. Everett had only just arrived overseas and was actually horrified by his assignment. He accepted it with reluctance, due partly to the awarness of his own professional inadequacies (having had virtually no courtroom experience previously), but primarily for the repugnance he felt for the ostensible crimes of his clients.

After the trial, his continuing efforts for the Malmédy defendants was due to his belief that justice had not been properly served.

Six Army attorneys were designated assistant defense counsel; of these, only one, Lieutenant Colonel Granger G. Sutton, had had extensive courtroom experience.

A civilian member of the defense staff, Herbert J. Strong, born and raised in Germany, was a Jew and refugee from Nazi Germany. Being fluent in German, he was an invaluable member of the defense staff. Later, during the Senate hearings on the trial, Strong criticized the Army's conduct of the investigation and trial. He also believed, that while some of the defendants were guilty, it had not been proven beyond a reasonable doubt. And his testimony could not be easily brushed off as pro-Nazism or anti-Semitism.

The defendants were also allowed to engage native German counsel, and some did so, but their value was limited due to the ever-present language problem and their unfamiliarity with American legal procedure.

The orginial investigation team assigned to the case included Captain Dwight Fanton, a graduate of Yale Law School, Captain Raphael Shumacker, First Lieutenant William R. Perl, and two civilian Army employees, Morris Elowitz and Harry Thon. Perl, Thon, Elowitz, Shumacker, and another investigator, Joseph Kirschbaum, were accused, during the trial, of having used physical and psychological duress in order to extract sworn statements from the defendants. The use of mock trials and threats was admitted by the investigators, but all manner of physical abuse was denied.

The following allegations were made by defendant Hendel:

> . . .on 4 April 1946 I was led from my cell under a black hood, was put into a cell facing the door and was then

> beaten in the abdomen and face until I fell to the ground. When a moment later the hood was taken off, Lieutenant Perl and Mr. Thon stood before me. During the subsequent interrogation, I was also beaten several times. No notice was taken of my request to have the interrogation postponed since I was not in condition for it at that time. The facts described happened before my interrogation. During the interrogation, promises were made to me but since I did not know anything and today still do not know anything of an order, all sorts of threats were made to me and since things were immaterial to me and I wanted to avoid further beatings, etc., I wrote down everything that was dictated to me.

Many additional allegations were made by defendants, all in the same vein.

Later, the Senate investigation would show that at least some of these allegations of physical brutality, denied by the interrogators at the trial, were founded in evidence.

The prosecution team for the trial included interrogators Perl, Thon, Elowitz, Kirschbaum and Shumacker, plus First Lieutenant Robert E. Byrne and Lieutenant Colonels Homer B. Crawford and Burton F. Ellis. Ellis became chief prosecutor.

The guards at the prison where the interrogations took place were not under the control of the war crimes team. They also, for a time, included Polish refugees who harbored considerable resentment towards Germans--and especially SS men. Some defendants specifically mention physical abuse by these guards as they were being led between their cells and the interrogation rooms and while waiting in halls, all the time wearing black hoods over their heads. (The hoods were claimed to be necessary to keep the prisoners form recognizing each other and to prevent them form speaking to fellow soldiers.) Kicking, punching, beating about the arms, and pushing prisoners down stairs, in addition to verbal abuse, was conducted frequently, much to the amusement of the perpetrators.

After the trial, Everett attempted to get the Supreme Court to hear the appeal of the Malmédy Case defendants. In May 1948 the Court's decision not to hear the appeal prompted the Secretary of the Army, Kenneth C. Royall, to order a stay of execution of the sentences pending further investigation.

This decision by Royall prompted at least some persons who had been close to the case to comment.

A letter from James R. Rosenfeld, father of one of the American soldiers alleged to have been shot by Peiper's men at the Baugnez crossroads, to Senator Irving M. Ives, was in protest to Royall's decision. It stated in part:

> It appears that the defense attorney for the Germans, Colonel Everett, does not ask that the sentences be set aside because of their innocence but solely because of the weird procedure allegedly used by the American prosecutors in seeking confessions.
>
> I am altogether in favor of accused German soldiers being ably defended to the last ditch. However, I am certain that they received a fair trial and due justice rendered in their sentences. But in view of the fact that the act for which they were convicted was such an outrageous atrocity, I feel that the War Department would be indulging in mock sentimentality were their sentences to be remitted because of overly shrewd legal tactics or the invoking of minor technicalities of the law.
>
> I would therefore appreciate anything that you can properly do in behalf of the memory of my son and those other American soldiers so cold-bloodedly massacred to the end that just law and not legal technicalities shall prevail.

One of the survivors, Virgil P. Lary, also protested, writing directly to Royall. He stated:

> I was the only officer to survive this ordeal and I am now in a retired status due to disability received at that time. I mention this as I feel that it is necessary for you to know that I am competent to discuss this case. It was my pleasure to return to Dachau and to testify with other survivors.
>
> Before the Malmédy Case was heard we spent three months in Europe awaiting the trial to begin. During this period I personally observed the techniques and methods used by the War Crime Teams in obtaining confessions. . . only the fairest methods were used in the interrogations. No group of Army personnel have ever, in my opinion, conducted their investigation more thorougly or efficiently. Any criticism from an individual that did not have an opportunity to observe this work is unfair, unkind to the parents, wives and children of those American men and is not based on

truth. I am certain that you will quickly find that what I say here is correct when you conduct your investigation.

If you so desire I would be happy to present a true, unquestionable picture to you or your investigating group.

However, a letter from Fiske H. Ventres to Royall, provides a different view:

. . .at Bremen, Germany, I was billeted with a member of the War Crimes Commission who had just resigned his post because of the methods employed by "Americans" to gain confessions and convictions. According to him confessions were the sole evidence against the accused and no methods were too brutal to employ in gaining the confessions. One defendant was beaten to death because of his refusal to sign a confession and as a lesson to his other unwilling fellow defendants. To prove his point the resigned agent produced from his trunk the blood-caked hood he, himself, had removed from the head of the murdered German.

From one end of Europe to the other, people are quite aware of the true character of these so-called trials, from Nuremberg to the Bulge. They know full well the identity of those conducting the proceedings and, I might add, a great many Europeans are more than a little suspicious that what is being done is more in the interest of another nation than to the United States.

The first two letters characterize the general mood of the country towards the trial and its defendants. Not until the Senate investigation did that mood begin to change. After the investigation, things quieted down. But then in 1956, after Dietrich had been released from prison and Peiper's release was immient, the call for vengeance was renewed.

Articles in magazines and newspapers retold the story of the atrocities and the trial–too often glossing over, or totally ignoring, the irregularities in the interrogations and trial. And it made little difference that the facts in these articles were often grossly inaccurate.

One article in particular, written by Emile C. Schurmacher and published in the May 1956 issue of a sensationalistic pulp magazine called *Real Adventure*, was titled, "Who Turned the Killers Loose?" Schurmacher's account of the incident reads more like fiction; the majority of his errors

could have been corrected had he examined the trial records.

Peiper was, of course, released despite the outcry from "concerned citizens" and most of the veterans organizations. In 1964 he moved to France where he made a comfortable living as a translator. But in 1976 a sensational article on Peiper appeared in a French communist newspaper. A two-week campaign of threats and harassment followed, during which time Peiper was preparing to leave France, and on the night of 14/15 July, he was killed in a fire-bomb attack on his house.

A CIA agent in Bern, Switzerland, claimed to have unmasked Peiper and put the information of his whereabouts in the hands of his killers. Yet Peiper's residence was not a real secret. A group calling themselves the "Avengers" (supposedly composed of former members of the French resistance) claimed responsibility for Peiper's death. But it is believed that Israel's Mossad was actually responsible; they were operating in France at the time against Palestinians; they were the only ones with the motivation and means to kill him, and Simon Wiesenthal had also suddenly started up a campaign against Peiper.

There are still, however, many unanswered, and even unasked, questions:

Why are the statements and testimony of a handful of the survivors continuously repeated as evidence of a massacre? What about the statements made by the other survivors?

In the initial attack on the American column at the Baugnez crossroads, some GIs were wounded. Descriptions of the attack indicate that the column was fired on by all manner of tank cannon, mortars, machine gun and small arms fire. Photos clearly show the destroyed, burned-out, and bullet-and-shrapnel-riddled vehicles of the column. It would seem highly unlikely that no one would be killed in such a battle. Were any Americans killed in the battle, prior to the alleged massacre? If so, how many–and are they included in the number of dead alleged to have been murdered by Peiper's men?

What was the "new information" Everett wired Peiper he was on his way over with? (Everett died before he could make the trip.)

The big question seems to be whether or not an order existed that prisoners were to be shot. No proof of a written order has ever been found. Many of the defendants claimed orders to such effect were given by their superiors, prior to and during the Offensive.

The prosecution's claim that such an order had been given by Hitler or at least some higher authority above Dietrich could not be conclusively proven, although some comments made by Dietrich and others to their subordinates could be interpreted in different ways.

If such an order was given by any higher authority above Peiper, why was his unit the only one to carry them out? If the order originated with Peiper, why did they kill only some prisoners and not others?

U.S. troops not only brutalized and killed German prisoners on their own–before, during and after the Battle of the Bulge--but orders to that effect had been given. An order issued on 21 December 1944 by Headquarters of the U.S. 328th Infantry Regiment stated:

"No SS troops or paratroops will be taken prisoner, and will be shot on sight."

Isn't just the issuance of such an order a war crime? Weren't some of the Malmédy Case defendants being accused of the exact same crime? How many German bodies littered the battlefields who had been the victims of American and Allied war crimes? Where is their justice?

And there are many more questions that need to be asked. More importantly, they need to be answered, although many will probably never be satisfactorily answered.

For those who desire to do some further reading on this subject, I can recommend James J. Weingartner's *Crossroads of Death: The Story of the Malmédy Massacre and Trial*, published last year by the Unversity of California Press. This work, above all others that I have examined to date, is the most complete and, perhaps, the most objective account, but it is still far from the final word on the subject.

Another account which I have been informed is somewhat objective is Charles Whiting's *Massacre at Malmédy*, originally published in 1971 by Stein and Day. Some groups thought the book too objective and apparently forced the

publisher to stop selling it; copies of that edition have proven hard to find. However, earlier this year Stein and Day's new catalog included a listing of this title in a paperback edition.

At the trial Everett concluded his closing summary with a quote from Tom Paine:

> He that would make his own liberty secure must guard even his enemy from oppression, for if he violates this duty, he establishes a precedent which will reach himself.

And finally, a personal interview with Peiper had been arranged for Weingartner. Unfortunately, Peiper's untimely death occurred before the interview took place. Ultimately, Weingartner concludes his book with:

"In some sense, Peiper was one more victim of the crossroads of death. May he be the last."

Fire In The Reichstag

PETER WAINWRIGHT

By the early 1930s, the situation in Germany was becoming highly explosive. A third of the workers were unemployed, and democracy was on the verge of collapse. The Communists saw in this their best opportunity to seize power since their abortive revolution in 1918. A revolution was clearly in the offing, but despite the support of a few million voters and the Soviet Union, power seemed to be slipping from the Marxist grip.

The German people were turning to a new kind of socialism—National Socialism—and even some of the Communists were looking to Adolf Hitler for their salvation.

The Red response to this situation was one of extreme violence. One notable victim was the 21-year old poet and voluntary social worker Horst Wessel, who was murdered in 1930 after writing a stirring marching song for his Brown Shirt comrades. Two years later, as the General Election of July 1932 loomed nearer, the Reds abandoned all pretence of debate and discussion. Bloody terror became the order of the day.

In the six week period before the election there were more than 450 political riots in Prussia alone. In July, 38 Nazis and 30 Communists were killed. But the Red Terror failed. In the election, the Nazis more than doubled their number of seats in the Reichstag, and became the largest party; and in January 1933 President Hindenburg bowed to the inevitable and asked Adolf Hitler to lead a coalition government. The general election in the March of that year resulted in a clear victory for the Nazis and their nationalist allies.

Red fury now knew no bounds. In the campaign of violence and illegality that followed, the Union of Red Fighters openly called on their followers to disarm the SA and SS, while a few days later an official Communist publication, *Red Sailor*, urged: "Workers to the Barricades: forward to victory: fresh bullets in your guns: draw the pin of the hand grenades." A bloody revolution seemed imminent. A signal

for its commencement was anxiously awaited, and it appeared to come on 27 February when the Reichstag building in Berlin was set on fire.

A Dutch communist, Van der Lubbe, was arrested near the scene, and subsequently he and four other suspects, including Torgler, the leader of the communist group in the Reichstag, were put on trial. The official report of the provisional inquiry showed that the Red group had had "a remarkable number of party meetings in the Reichstag of late, without any reason which could be traced." At Liebknechthaus (the Communist HQ named after a leader of the abortive 1918 revolution), the authorities found lists of a large number of people who were to have been killed or arrested.

Van der Lubbe admitted that he had fired the building and that it was meant to be a signal for revolution. But, he claimed, contrary to expert testimony at the trial, that he had destroyed the building single handed. He stuck to his story, but elsewhere the Reds were spreading the lie that the fire had been started by the Nazis themselves, and that Van der Lubbe was a degenerate half-wit and homosexual prostitute planted on the scene as a "fall guy."

Just two days after the fire the *Daily Worker* (forerunner of the *Morning Star*) official organ of the British Communist Party, carried the banner headline "Nazis burn down the German parliament," and then went on to state that the "Fascists" had accused the Communist Party of having done it "without a shred of evidence."

Thus was born one of the great myths of modern history—that the Nazis set fire to their own Parliament to provide an excuse for curbing the activities of the Communists. It might be said that some plausibility was given to the myth by the action of President Hindenburg (who was not a Nazi) on the day after the fire.

Fearing that another Communist revolution had started, he declared martial law and suppressed Marxist propaganda in Prussia. More substance was provided for the myth when the old Weimar Constitution was changed by the passing of the Enabling Act, which has been falsely represented as giving dictatorial powers to Hitler.

The act had nothing to do with the Reichstag fire, but was a necessary part of the Government's program for overcoming the grave social and economic crisis in Germany. Nonetheless, such actions provided hooks on which the anti-Nazi media and politicians could hang their multi-colored coat of lies and misrepresentation which came to be seriously accepted as authentic history.

The trial of Van der Lubbe and the other suspects should have dispelled any suspicion of Nazi guilt. It was a scrupulously fair trial which resulted in the acquittal of all the defendants except Van der Lubbe himself.

Anti-Nazi propagandists, however, were far from being dismayed. They turned their attention on a *Brown Book* of alleged evidence compiled by communist exiles, and a farcical "counter-trial" which they staged in London which, not surprisingly, found the Nazis guilty.

According to the *Brown Book*, a group of Nazis entered the Reichstag via a tunnel which was connected to the residence of Herman Göring, President of the Reichstag. They were supposed to have gained entry at 8.40pm, set the building on fire and then left, after pushing the half-wit Van der Lubbe into the building just after 9pm. The police arrived on the scene at 9.22pm. Evidence was given at the "counter-trial" by witnesses, purporting to be Nazis seeking repentance, that they were led by a Brown Shirt named Heines. It was ascertained later that Heines was making a speech elsewhere at the time of the fire.

Another confession was supposedly made by Karl Ernst, then chief of the Brown Shirts in Berlin. Apart from the fact that this confession did not turn up until after Ernst's death, it slipped up on one vital point. As with the other "confessions," it alleged that the Nazi arsonists were in the Reichstag from 8.40pm until 9.30pm. But at 8.45pm, a postman entered the building to collect the mail, and left again at 8.55pm without seeing anything out of the ordinary or noticing the smell of gasoline or other fire raising substances.

The full truth is not yet known, but sound basic facts—certainly more than enough to discredit allegations of Nazi responsibility were brought to light in Britain by the liberal historian Professor A. J. P. Taylor, who admits that he had

accepted the myth unquestioningly "without looking at the evidence."

Later, however, writing on "Who burnt the Reichstag" in the August 1960 issue of the specialist magazine *History Today*, Taylor, working largely on evidence provided by Fritz Tobias, an anti-Nazi German civil servant, and which had been published earlier in *Der Spiegel*, points out that the Nazis made no attempt to manufacture evidence against the Communists—which seems a strange omission if, as alleged, the whole affair was staged to justify the suppression of the Communists.

As for the counter-trial, one of the witnesses there was "muffled to the eyes" according to Taylor, who wryly adds: "This was a wise precaution: he was in fact a well-known communist and unmistakably Jewish."

When considering the facts, it seems incredible that the myth of Nazi responsibility for firing the Reichstag could ever have been accepted at all. Yet it was, and by reputable historians such as Alan Bullock, author of *Hitler: A Study in Tyranny*, and Anthony Sutton, author of *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*. One wonders what other mythical versions of historical incidents have been accepted by historians and others "without looking at the evidence."

Zionism & American Jews

ALFRED M. LILIENTHAL

It had been a nasty, rainy night when an elderly, affluent Hartford couple made their way from their home to a meeting. As their car slowly turned left at the entrance to the Jewish Community Center, another automobile raced out of the fog and rammed into them. My cousin, whose countless civil and philanthropic deeds had endeared her to the community, was dead before she could reach the hospital; her husband seriously injured.

Ever since the appearance of my *Readers' Digest* article, in which I crossed swords with Zionist Organization chieftain, Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, my relatives in Hartford had looked upon me as a plain and simple nut, if not a traitor. Former close family ties had deteriorated to a point of near-total ostracism. Nevertheless, blood is thicker than water, and I rushed to Connecticut for the last rites of a wonderful woman, and was among the 800 to pay Sunday morning tribute to her in a packed synagogue—the very one from which, in the presence of many family members, I had been excoriated by the rabbi during the High Holy Days services thirty years earlier for daring to speak out publicly against Zionism.

Having flown up from Washington, I spent the night at the home of other cousins from whom my iconoclastic views had separated me even before the *Digest* piece appeared.

Cousin Bern and I stayed up reminiscing late into the night, and, of course, the Middle East crisis came into our conversation. "You know, I have never been a Zionist," he said. "But something had to be done to provide a home for Jewish refugees. That is why I have always supported the State of Israel, given substantially to the UJA, and even headed the Hartford drive." This reasoning, so typical of thousands of other Jews, has been responsible for the Zionist takeover of the American Jewish community—lock, stock and barrel.

My rejoinder, I feared, fell on ears as deaf as those I had encountered in my continual efforts to open doors to reasoning and to banish emotionalism. Americans of Jewish faith

cannot visualize the extent to which their rabbis and secular leadership, operating through Organized Jewry, have totally deceived them into confusing humanitarianism with nation-building, religion and nationalism. A home could have been found in 1947 for the 285 000 survivors of Hitler's concentration camps without ever establishing a state; just as today security for the Jews of Israel can be obtained without the continued expansionism wrought by the West Bank settlements policy or the ruthless repression of the rights of the Palestinian people.

But only an ever-larger state will appease the hungry ambitions of Zionist leaders. Privately they have incessantly declared that they have no interest in refugees, only in creating a sovereign state. In their atheism and agnosticism, they have manifested even less concern for Judaism, the religious faith. Adroitly exploiting Nazi genocide, their propaganda has used the Holocaust to extract a blank check from Zionist and non-Zionist coreligionists which enabled them in 1948 to bet the future of American Judaism on the roulette of power politics.

Speaking unqualifiedly in the name of all Jews, Zionist acumen made certain that the politicians remained hypnotized more than ever by the "Jewish vote." All they had to do was to remind both political parties that their eloquent support of Israel was a prerequisite for their conquest of pivotal election states.

When so much is at stake in the Middle East, inevitably the question must arise: How has the Zionist will been imposed on the American people? Far from all Jews believed in the concept of the Jewish state, and the Jews themselves constituted but a very small minority of the American population, less than three percent. Is it possible that Americans have been so apathetic that six million can manipulate 230 million?

But there are many compelling reasons why population figures are of little relevance to the Zionist success story. Mahatma Gandhi once remarked: "Numbers are not critical to any struggle. Strength and purpose are." This strength, matched by wealth and position, can be summed up in one word: power. The Zionists have been able to muster fantastic muscle at the right moment and at the right place, or instill the fear that it might be used.

The triumph of Zionism would never have been possible without the 20th century's Holy Trinity: Hitler, the supine politicians and the compliant media. By labeling those who opposed the course upon which Israeli leadership intractably committed their new state as "anti-Semitic," they crushed budding dissent. Without understanding the underlying reasons, the Jewish rank and file could point to the large number of prominent Christian supporters of the state and boast: "Just as it is not necessary to be Jewish to love Levy's rye bread, so one need not be Jewish to be a Zionist." Everyone loves a winner. What little organized opposition there was to Zionism totally collapsed with Israel's stirring victory in the June 1967 six-day war. The anti-Zionist American Council for Judaism all but vanished, and thereafter, even non-Zionists were not ashamed to be counted in Zionists ranks, as *Commentary* editor Norman Podhertz so loudly proclaimed in "Now, Instant Zionism."

A principal reason for the remarkable political success achieved by the Jewish connection and the Zionist connectors lies deep in the American political system. Our system of representative government has been profoundly affected by the growing influence and affluence of minority pressure groups, whose strength invariably increases as presidential elections approach. This makes it virtually impossible to formulate foreign policy in the American national interest. The Electoral College system has greatly fortified the position of the national lobbies established by ethnic, religious and other minority pressure groups—the Jewish-Zionist-Israel lobby in particular.

Under this anachronistic system, state votes go as a unit to the candidate winning a plurality of the vote, which endows a well-organized lobby with tremendous bargaining power. And the Jewish connection has been augmented by the Jewish location: seventy-six percent of American Jewry is concentrated in sixteen cities of six states—California, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio and Florida—with 181 electoral votes. It only takes 270 electoral votes to elect the next President of the United States.

This explains why the politicians have been mesmerized by fear of the "Jewish vote" in a hotly contested state. The inordinate Israelist influence over the White House, the Congress and other elected officials, stems from this ability

to pander bloc votes, as well as to fill the campaign coffers of both parties with timely contributions. The individual Jew who might not go along with Zionist ideology or Jewish nationalism is too cowardly to speak out and take the usurpers of his voice to task; and so the peddling goes forward.

Few Jews appreciate the methodology employed by the powerful Zionist lobby in Washington to keep the politicians in line. It's not exactly pretty, and even in the declining morality of our day, I am certain that many would be revolted by what is done in their name to help the Middle East's "bastion of democracy."

This lobby, fully integrated within our national elective process, has become intrinsic to the warp and woof of the U.S. political system for the past thirty-two years. Show me a man who is running for President, and I will show you invariably a politician who will not dare offend this potent lobby. Show me a legislator in either branch of the congress, and I will show you an office holder who invariably bows to this powerful pressure group. Whereas other pressure groups may have to comb the congressional offices, arguing the merits of certain proposals in order to gain the necessary affirmative votes, the Israeli lobby channels information to its many allies in Congress, rounds up scores of assured votes when they are needed, and has the pleasant task of urging well-intentioned, overly eager members not to wander off with their own competing legislation in support of Israel.

During the height of the 1973 war, a thirty-six hour phone blitz by I.L. Kenen, the head of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC, the Israeli lobby), resulted, on 18 October, in the immediate introduction of legislation in both houses to transfer "Phantom aircraft and other equipment in the quantities needed by Israel to repel aggressors in the amount of $2.2 billion." A massive campaign prefaced the passage of this military aid bill, and an attempt to strip $500 million from the legislation was defeated when Kenen fired off ninety-five telegrams to House Appropriations and Foreign Affairs Committee members.

When the influential chairman of the latter committee, Clement J. Zablocki, sought across-the-board reductions in military exports to Middle East countries, including Israel,

he found himself forced to bow to Zionist pressure. The "Israel-Firsters" and AIPAC moved to block him from assuming the chairmanship of the committee in the 95th Congress. Only after a bitter, behind the scenes, conference was an amicable arrangement worked out. The Congressman has not since opposed any of Israel's lofty ambitions on Captiol Hill.

Surprisingly, it was the *New York Times* itself, usually the staunchest supporter of Zionist and Israeli goals, which exposed and analyzed frankly the activities of this most powerful of pressure groups in an August 1975 article. As a demonstration of an allegedly new, U.S. impartiality, President Ford had agreed to sell Jordan the improved Hawk missiles with the NAS systems worth some $256 million. But the lobby went immediately to work. A secret communication about the proposed sale, based on a classified Defense Department document, sent by the White House to members of the Senate Foreign Relations and the House Foreign Affairs Committees, was leaked to AIPAC by Zionist aides of New Jersey Senator Clifford P. Case and New York Representative Jonathan B. Bingham. Immediately, the lobby mobilized its organization in 197 major and 200 smaller cities across the country, warning of the dangers to Israel. In a two-page memorandum and letter describing the scope and nature of the proposed sale, the lobby concluded that it was capable of "providing cover for offensive operations against Israel."

The communities were called upon to act at once and to apply forceful pressure. Within twenty-four hours of the memorandum's distribution, congressmen were besieged with phone calls, telegrams and mailgrams from constituents urging them to oppose the Hawk sale to Jordan.

Despite the threat that Jordan's King Hussein might turn elsewhere, even to the Soviet Union, the legislators stuck by their guns, and the matter was tabled. An unidentified Democratic Senator was quoted in the *Times* as saying that he would only talk without attribution about the Israeli lobby "because they can deliver votes and they control a lot of campaign contributions. That's why I cannot go on the record or I'd be dead."

"It's the strongest lobby," the Senator added. "It doesn't

dilute its strength by lobbying on other issues—a lot of members resent it, but they don't feel they can do anything about it. That lobby wants to do Congress' thinking on Israel—they don't want any independent judgements."

Demands on the Justice Department to investigate how a classified White House document had been transmitted to an agent of the State of Israel were ignored. The lobby was too strong.

Spade work on the Hill has been carried out by a group of dedicated, key young staff people. Michael Kraft from Senator Case's office; Stephen Bryen of the Middle East subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Scott Cohen, Senator Charles Percy's aide; Richard Perle of Senator Henry Jackson's staff; Richard D. Siegel from Pennsylvania Senator Richard Shweicker's office; Mel Grossman, an aide to Florida's Edward J. Gurney; Edward A. "Pete" Lakeland, Jacob Javits' aide; Daniel L. Speigel from Senator Muriel Humphrey's office; Mel Levine, an aide to California's John V. Tunney; Jay Berman from Birch Bayh's office; and Kenneth Davis, an assistant to Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania when he was Minority Leader.

According to Stephan D. Isaacs in his book *Jews and American Politics*, this group has worked "quietly, drafting legislation and other materials and mounting 'backfires' to ensure support of appropriate legislation advancing Israel's many causes" while Senators Jackson, Javits, Ribicoff and others worked "out front" to garner support among fellow Senators.

It was this effort that was responsible for the passage of the Jackson-Vanick amendment to the 1972 U.S. trade agreement with the Soviet Union, the first nail placed in the coffin of détente. Pleas of President Ford—who had earlier expressed sympathy for the plight of Soviet Jewry in a "State of the World" address—to reject this amendment as inimical to American interests and relations with the Soviet Union were to no avail. Jackson, the lobby's stalwart champion on the issue of Soviet Jewry, insisted on encumbering the agreement, mutually advantageous to the U.S. and the Soviet Union, with the amendment guaranteeing an annual emigration of a set number of Soviet Jews. Whether détente is good or not for the U.S. is debatable, but to link this issue with the question of Soviet Jewry is a wholly untenable position.

The one senator who, over many years, consistently refused to bow to Zionist pressures and who defied the Israeli lobby was Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman J. William Fulbright. He incurred Zionist wrath when he stated on "Face the Nation" in 1973 that: "The Israelis control the policy of the Congress and the Senate. . .Somewhere around 80% of the Senate of the U.S. is completely in support of Israel—of anything Israel wants. . ."

Jews in Arkansas blasted the Senator: "Fulbright's rival in the May 1974 Democratic primary, Governor Dale Bumpers boasted:

> I could have bought central Arkansas with the offers of money from the Jewish community. . .The offer of assistance came from people in New York and California who had raised a lot of money in the Jewish community for political purposes.

To the great satisfaction of the lobby, this flow of money helped defeat Senator Fulbright and return him to private life. But this victory in the long run may turn out to be only a Pyrrhic one for American Jews.

In a memorable speech on the floor of the Senate, Mr Fulbright had placed "the whipsawing of foreign policy by certain minority groups to the detriment of the national interest" in its broader, historical perspective:

> Mr. President, this nation has welcomed millions of immigrants from abroad. In the 19th century we were called the melting pot, and we were proud of that description. It meant that there came to this land people of diverse creeds, colors and races. These immigrants became good Americans, and their ethnic or religious origins were of secondary importance. But in recent years we have seen the rise of organizations dedicated apparently, not to America, but to foreign states and groups. The conduct of foreign policy for America has been seriously compromised in this development. We can survive this development, Mr. President, only if our political institutions—and the Senate in particular—retain their objectivity and their independence so that they can serve all Americans.

But as long as legislative staff members kept their Jewishness uppermost in mind, vital objectivity could never be accomplished.

The Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith, likewise, has done its share in "converting" congressmen at critical moments. Opposition to sending the deadly C-3 concussion bombs to the Zionist state immediately brought overt suggestions from the ADL that opponents were secretly anti-Semitic. "That's the perversive force they strike at in the hearts of members up here," one Capitol Hill aide was quoted as saying. "If you're in opposition to anything Israel wants, you get a big white paintbrush that says you're anti-Semitic."

The story behind legislative chicanery in behalf of Israel scarcely ever surfaces, and when it does, it is summarily dismissed as anti-Semitic propaganda. But one day, predicted a senior U.S. diplomat, according to *Newsweek* magazine, there will be a congressional investigation into how we lost the Middle East that will make the great China debate seem trivial. It is sad to contemplate how many innocent American Jews may suffer for the actions of their self-appointed spokesmen. The undue influence registered by a small minority on behalf of a foreign state will indeed not look pretty.

In the light of day, the link between the thirteen-year Israeli occupation of Holy Jerusalem and the course taken by the Islamic revolution in Iran will be more than clear. The unholy alliance forged between Iran and Israel, supported by pressure on successive presidents, together with the Henry Kissinger-Nelson Rockefeller initiative, during the midst of the hostage crisis, in bringing the Shah to the U.S., will one day become common knowledge. More people, to use the 1948 words of the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* at the time of Israel's establishment, will complain about "the shameful junking of international interests to regain Jewish votes." The silencing of criticism of Israeli policy by a veritable world *Who's Who*, ranging from philosopher William Ernest Hocking, Father Daniel Berrigan and Dorothy Thompson to Dag Hammarskjold, Bruno Kreisky and Charles de Gaulle, will in the long run prove to have been a real tragedy for all Americans.

Can the Jewish community in the United States be brought to its senses before total disaster overtakes it? Can the process, once described by the editor of the *Jewish Newsletter* William Zuckerman as "Campaign Judaism," by

which this community has "almost consciously emptied itself of all higher aspirations and spiritual needs and has willingly limited itself to the role of financial milk cow for others" be brought to an end? It will indeed be difficult to tear Jewish leaders and their wives from the massive Israeli Bond and UJA drives, from Hadassah teas, and gaudy banquets, and garish publicity, all masked as philanthrophic functions.

Professor of Organic Chemistry at the Hebrew University, Israel Shahak, himself a survivor of Bergen-Belsen, maintains that undeviating devotion to the State of Israel by Israeli and American Jews is "both immoral and against the mainstream of Jewish tradition and is nothing but Jewish apostasy."

Dr. Shahak added:

> Jews used to believe, and say it three times a day, that a Jew should be devoted to God, and God alone. A small minority still believe it. But it seems to me that the majority of my people has left God and substituted an idol in its place, exactly as happened when they were devoted to the golden calf in the desert and gave away their gold to make it. The name of this modern idol is the State of Israel.

It will be no simple task to detach Jews from such idolatrous worship. The blatant expansionism and racism, defiantly displayed by Prime Minister Begin did not awaken American Jews. They are unable to discern that the gravest danger to peace stems not so much from geographic expansionism, in the guise of security, or from the seizure of land belonging to Palestinian Arabs for centuries, but from ideological expansionism which views Palestine as belonging exclusively to the Jewish people as inchoate citizens of the state established in their name. It is extemely doubtful whether any successor to Menachem Begin, be he Shimon Peres or Ezer Weizman, will dare to attempt to cast Israel out of its Zionist mold or that there will be a Jewish American revolt.

The myth-makers have been too powerful in weaving their web. Hebrew, Israelite, Judean, Judaism and the Jewish people have been accepted as one, suggesting historic continuity. In fact they were different people in different

historical times with varying ways of life who continually intermarried with indigenous Amorites, Canaanites, Midianites, Phoenicians and other Semitic ancestors of the present-day Arabs. It is too often forgotten that Judaism was a tremendous proselytizing force throughout the world before, and even after, the coming of Jesus. In *The Thirteenth Tribe*, Arthur Koestler, supported overwhelmingly by such anthropologists as Ripley, Weissenberg, Hertz, Boas, Mead and Fishberg, proves that the vast majority of today's Jews are descendants of the Khazars of South Russia. They converted to Judaism in 70 A.D. at the time of the dispersion of the small, original Judaic Palestinian population by Roman Emperors Vespasian and Titus. The Ben-Gurions, the Golda Meirs, and Begins, who have clamored to go back "home," probably never had antecedents in that part of the world.

The American Jew has permitted the Zionist quest for roots in Palestine to lead him into the most dangerous shoals. The abnormal, unique relationship, which he has allowed to be carried out in his name, between Jews in the United States and Israel, has forged an "Israel-First" policy which is an underlying factor in the continuing tensions besetting the Middle East and the Islamic world. U.S. security interests have become endangered; an energy crisis has been thrust into every American home. The enmity towards the United States, incurred in the Arab-Muslim world, has eroded the measureless reservoir of goodwill stemming from the many educational and eleemosynary institutions founded by Americans.

In a world which has never needed spiritual faith more than during this present threat to civilization, universal Judaism has itself become gravely imperiled. For what is left of its universal, ethical precepts without the ethos of righteousness? In the ruthless takeover of Palestine, in driving out the indigenous population, the Israelis have violated tenets deeply imbeded in the preachments of the Prophets. And sadly, American Jews have compounded the felonly with racist attitudes towards Palestinians, in particular the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO).

What is both sad and equally ironic, is that in permitting themselves to be traumatized by a refuted racial myth, the

Jews of America have allowed Hitler to triumph. In doling out incarceration and death while sweeping through conquered Europe, the Führer undid the laws of emancipation and the process of integration for which so many Jews had so-long struggled, when he decreed: "You are not a German, you are a Jew—You are not a Frenchman, you are a Jew—You are not a Belgian, you are a Jew." Yet these are the identical words Zionist leaders intone as they meticulously promote the emigration to the Holy Land of Jews from around the globe, plotting their exodus from lands in which they have lived happily for centuries. Moshe Dayan succinctly expressed it in the *New York Times* magazine: "I am a Jew before I am an Israeli."

Rarely has the deceit of so few been so widely practiced to the detriment of so many, as in the formulation and implementation of American Middle East policy. But normal, friendly relations with all peoples of the region may still be restored. If the PLO is recognized by the U.S. and obstacles to the creation of a Palestinian state are removed, Arab and Jew, Muslim and Hebrew, in an atmosphere of justice, may still renew their millenial peaceful co-existence side by side. But there is no place for Zionism.

Such a happy goal is not illusory. It may be achieved when Jewish Americans find the courage to stand up as individuals and throw off the yoke of Organized Jewry. It is imperative—by word and, more importantly, by deed—for every Jew in the United States to articulate this credo openly and loudly: "Judaism is not Zionism—Zionism is not Judaism—anti-Zionism is not anti-Semitism. Israel's flag is, in no way, mine."

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

DR. ROBERT FAURISSON was born at Shepperton, near London, in 1929, to a French father and a Scottish mother. He was educated in Singapore, Japan, Marseille, and in Paris at the Sorbonne, where he received his doctorate in 1972. After a short spell teaching at the Sorbonne, Professor Faurisson became Associate Professor in French Literature at the University of Lyon-2 in central France. He specializes in the appraisal and evalution of texts and documents.

DR. ALFRED M. LILIENTHAL, a graduate of Cornell University and the Columbia Law School, served during World War Two in the Middle East. After a spell working for the U.S. State Department he became a full-time author and political commentator. He has written *What Price Israel?* (1953), *There Goes the Middle East*, *The Other Side of the Coin* and *The Zionist Connection* (1978). He also runs a monthly newsletter *Middle East Perspective*. This article first appeared in *Arab Perspectives*, June 1980. We feel this article to be of great interest to Revisionists, despite the author's apparent acceptance of the unfounded "Nazi genocide" allegation.

RAY MERRIAM was born in Norwalk, Connecticut in 1951. He is the editor and publisher of *Military Journal*.

PETER WAINWRIGHT works as a paralegal in a major British institute. This article first appeared in *League Review* ($15/yr; PO Box 384, London SW1, England).

MARK WEBER was raised in Oregon where he attended Jesuit High School. Before starting college he lived and worked in Bonn, Germany, and Kumasi, Ghana. Returning to the United States, he studied at University of Illinois, Chicago, then back to Europe for two semesters at University of Munich, Germany. He frequently did research at the Institute for Contemporary History; the IHR's "mirror image" on the Exterminationist side. In 1976, he graduated with high honors from Portland State University, with a BA in history. Receiving laudatory recommendations from a number of professors, he was offered several scholarships for post-graduate study. He chose a full fellowship from Indiana University, and studied and taught there for three semesters. He received his master's degree in central European history in December 1978. He now lives in the Washington, DC area, and works as a freelance German translator, and National Archives researcher.

ANDREAS R. WESSERLE was born in Prague, Czechoslovakia, into a German-Hungarian family. He was raised in Bohemia and Moravia, but later emigrated to the U.S.A. He received his B S in Sociology, and an M A in Political Science from Marquette University. He later received an M A in Political Sociology and Urban Affairs at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. He gained his Ph.D. in Government and Urban Planning at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. He is a member of several national honor societies, and received a Fulbright return fellowship in 1968. Having worked at the Institute for German Affairs at Marquette University from 1965 to 1966, he has also taught Sociology and Political Science at two large state universities and at three Catholic colleges in the mid-West and East.